DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 708 EA 012 200

TITLE	Annual AFL-CIO Education Conference Proceedings (Silver Spring, MD, March 18-21, 1979).
INSTITUTION	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 79
NOTE	183p.; Occasional pages may not reproduce clearly due to light print
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Programs; *Labor Education; *Labor Unions; Union Members

ABSTRACT

Presents the edited remarks of the speakers at the 1979 Annual AFL-CIO Education Conference. The sessions and workshops were focused on the question of how to educate on the important issues facing the labor movement. Speakers addressed such topics as the role of educators in organizing training, the organization of training programs, responses to anti-union "educational conferences," the Missouri campaign to defeat right-to-work legislation, psychological research in union-management relations, and the characteristics of committed union members. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177708

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCEEDINGS

Annual
AFL-CIO Education Conference

EA 012 200

The George Meany Labor Studies Center
Silver Spring, Maryland

March 18-21, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Czarnecki

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANNUAL

AFL-CIO EDUCATION CONFERENCE

PROCEEDINGS

March 18 - 21, 1979

GEORGE MEANY CENTER FOR LABOR STUDIES
Silver Spring, Maryland

opeiu #2 afl-cio

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Welcome 2
-Fred K. Hoehler, Executive Director,
George Meany Center for Labor Studies

Role of Educators in Organizing Training 6
-Alan Kistler, Director,
Dept. of Organization & Field Services, AFL-CIO

Organizing Training Programs

-William E. Roehl, Assistant Director,
Dept. of Organization & Field Services, AFL-CIO 14

-Jack Adams, Retail Clerks Int'l. Union
"Staff Training" 17

-Bruce Raynor, Associate Education Director,
Amal. Clothing & Textile Workers Union
"J. P. Stevens Organizing Campaign" 23

-Saul Nesselroth, Associate Professor, Labor
Education Center, Univ. of Connecticut 28

-Norm Eiger, Associate Director, Labor Education
Center, Rutgers University
"Internal & External Organizing: An Action-Simulation Approach to Training" 31

Response to Union Busting "Educational Conferences

-Robert L. Muehlenkamp, Organizing Director,
National Union of Hospital and Health Care
Employees, Local 1199 35

-Al Bilik, International Union of Electrical,
Radio and Machine Workers 44

-Harold McIver, Organizational Director,
Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO 51

Analysis of Successful Missouri Campaign to Defeat Right-To-Work -- Its implications for Educators

-Allen Zack, Assistant Director,
Public Relations Department, AFL-CIO 57

-Walter L. Davis, Special Assistant to the
President, Retail Clerks Int'l. Union
"Radio and Television Media Campaign" 60

-Mary Elkuss, Education Director, S.W. Regional
Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile
Workers Union 66

American Histadrut Cultural Exchange Institute 75
-Karen Chaikin, Coordinator

Remarks of Albert Shanker, President, American Federation of Teachers 78

COPE Check-off Campaign 89
-Al Barkan, Director, COPE, AFL-CIO

Page

Humanization of the Workplace 96
-Robert Schrank, The Ford Foundation

Quality of Work Projects 101
-Patsy Fryman, Assistant to the President, Communications Workers of America

Quality of Work Projects in the Public Sector 104
-Paul Rosenstein, Dept. of Education and Leadership Training, AFSCME

The "Unions for Youth" Project 110
-Ed Garvey, Executive Director, National Football League Players Association

Women and Trade Unions in Four European Countries 114
-Val Lorwin, University of Oregon
-Roberta Till-Retz, University of Oregon

Workshop Reports: "Promoting Equality"

"Collective Bargaining" 128
-Gloria Johnson, Education Director, IUE

"Training Women for Leadership" 131
-Anne Nelson, Co-Director, Institute for Education and Research on Women and Work, Cornell University

"Adapting Union Structure and Activities" 135
-Marge Rachlin, Senior Staff Associate, George Meany Center for Labor Studies

"Health and Safety Programs" 138
-George E. O'Connell, Director, Labor Education Center, University of Connecticut

National Endowment for the Arts 140
-Anne Clark, Program Coordination Office

Natonal Endowment for the Humanities 144
-Len Oliver, Special Assistant to the Chairman

Bread and Roses Project 146
-Connie Kopelov, Education Director, National Union of Hospital and Health Care Employees, #1199

Characteristics of Committed Union Members -- A Psychological Study 149
-Michael Gordon, University of Tennessee

Examining the Steward's Role 157
-Stuart Schmidt, Assoc. Professor of Industrial Relations and Organizational Behavior, Temple Univ.

Consultants and Unions 160
-A. Michael Gordon, Education and Training, Int'l. Union of Operating Engineers

Psychological Research in Union-Management Relations 163
-Theodore V. Purcell, S.J., Research Professor, Jesuit Center for Social Studies, Georgetown Univ.

Page

Appendix
  Program A-1
  Participants List A-4

opeiu #2 afl-cio

INTRODUCTION

The 1979 Annual AFL-CIO Education Conference convened March 18-21 at the George Meany Center for Labor Studies in Silver Spring, Maryland. We were well pleased with the attendance of 159 participants from unions, colleges and universities who spent a productive three days in plenary and workshop sessions discussing how to educate on the important issues facing the labor movement.

Participants heard major presentations on a variety of topics, germane to labor's interest, given by leading experts in their respective fields.

This report provides the edited version of the remarks of the many speakers. I hope you will find it useful to you in your work.

Walter G. Davis, Director
Department of Education, AFL-CIO

Fred K. Hoehler, Jr.
Executive Director,
George Meany Center for Labor Studies

Welcome

I am glad that Walter Davis has seen fit to bring you back to this campus. And, I hope that you have a good and fruitful time during your stay here.

First, let me tell you about two projects which were not started when you were here last.

About six months ago we received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to develop an Oral History Project. Alice Hoffman, Associate Professor from the Pennsylvania State University, joined us as Project Director.

With the help of two advisory committees, we selected a theme- "merger." Interviewers were trained and are now in the process of interviewing individuals who were involved in the merger of the AFL and the CIO. By the way, this is a topic which has been virtually untouched by scholars.

The tapes collected will be part of the archival center which is planned for this campus.

The second project is one that concerns apprentices and community colleges. The Project Director is Richard Hindle, also of Penn State.

The purpose of this program is to combine apprenticeship training, general studies and labor studies in a program leading to an Associate in Labor Studies degree. Indentured apprentices will matriculate in community colleges that will cooperate in developing an academic program that grants credit for the apprentices' related science courses and practicum, general studies provided by the community college, and labor studies developed by the George Meany Center for Labor Studies.

This contract is designed to bring together a network of community colleges, local management and labor apprenticeship programs, and National Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committees under the leadership of the George Meany Center for Labor Studies to develop such a "tripartite" program that will permit indentured apprentices to complete their apprenticeship and earn their journeyman's card at the same time they are completing the general studies and labor studies required by their community college for an Associate Degree.

The product that I consider the most important outcome of this project will be the development of labor studies courses in seven areas. These courses, which will be of high quality, will be, I think, in demand by colleges and universities.

Walter asked if I wanted to say a few more words than welcome and indeed I do.

What with time rushing along the way it does, I should not be shocked but I am by the fact that the first meeting of the Board of Trustees of the AFL-CIO Labor Studies Center was held on May 16, 1969. That's very close to ten years ago.

For those of you who are interested in figures -- by June approximately 15,000 trade unionists will have been involved in programs at the Center since we held our first institute in that downtown basement in December, 1969. Their average age has been 41. Their years in the labor movement working at their particular staff jobs is 7 years, and statistics collected last year indicate that the average years in formal schooling has increased from 11 to almost 13.

Most important, I sense that labor education is finally coming of age within the labor movement. Unions that just two or three years ago would not have spent any time or money on education are now asking us to develop programs for them. Unions which have always been involved seem to be doing more. Finally, university and college programs have substantially increased in number.

Four reasons account for this new interest.

1. Some elected officials are beginning to see that training leads to some positive results.
2. Labor officials are impressed by the fact that the AFL-CIO has put a substantial amount of money and numbers of staff into education and training, and that the officers and executive council have been totally supportive.
3. More and more vice presidents, district directors and general officers have had personal experience with labor education and liked what happened to them.
4. There is a general societal trend toward adult education, continuing education and lifelong learning.

To highlight that last point you should know that a study in 1977 indicated that there are some 45,000 specialists in business and industry who devote most of their time to education and training assignments. And, that 80 percent of the 2 billion spent by large companies remained inside the company for its own continuing education programming.

Equally staggering figures can be found for the universities and the state and federal governments.

The question that you and I must face is how are we going to handle the increased interest and the increased need.

My observation is that we had better gear up immediately or lose our labor students to the general adult education operations run by universities, community colleges, churches, school systems, and business.

In no particular order of importance then:

1. We should find out who is out there. Who wants or needs training and education -- how many officers, at what levels; how many staff, doing what jobs; what rank and file in what industries and services. This information is just not available anywhere except in the crudest form.
2. We have to rationalize the system in some way. Can we devise a cohesive coordinated approach to labor education and training from local union administration through advanced institutes in the natural and social sciences. Can the individual unions, the AFL-CIO Department of Education, the George Meany Center and the labor programs in universities and colleges work out a relationship that allows adaptability to local problems, that recognizes the peculiar blend of heterogeneity and homogeneity of our publics and that provides for flexibility.
3. Basic to the need for rationalization is the need for another attempt to find out what we are doing right now. How many classes are being held by whom and for what purpose. Who is being reached and how many are doing what. Most of us have just tried to extrapolate from the Rogin-Rachlin report and that is 15 years old.
4. Somehow we have to extract money from the government to help in our training activities. At the very least funds should be available to acquaint trade unionists with the laws, and the philosophy behind those laws under which the labor movement is forced to operate and which are essentially non-adversary. The example set by OSHA this past year is a start. Funds should also be made available to cover ERISA, the social insurances -- social security, workers compensation, unemployment compensation, the NLRA and the

LMRA for example.

5. We should urge the broadening and deepening of negotiated tuition-aid benefits. Now, less than two million workers are covered by such plans and in many of these the education must be job-related.
6. For years we have been talking about the need to develop materials and we are still talking and they still need to be developed. Along with this we had better become more conversant with the new electronic gadgets and gimmicks. Some of them are invaluable aids in adult education.
7. We will have to train more young people as labor educators, both from within and without the labor movement. And, we will have to find places for them in our unions and in our universities.
8. Finally, I said that labor education is coming of age. I do not kid myself that that age has arrived. We will have to convince more of the leadership that training and education does pay off -- that education is not a "net loss" to the organization, but is an investment which will strengthen and enhance the growth and stability of the union.

Well, I could go on, as I know each of you could. I just wanted to say that I have been involved in labor education for over thirty years in universities, in unions, and even in such an operation as the Brookings Institution. And I have never felt more positive about what we are doing and about the opportunities which lie ahead.

Thank you.

Alan Kistler, Director
Department of Organization
and Field Services, AFL-CIO

Role of Educators in Organizing Training

Your invitation to come here couldn't have arrived at a better time. I feel we are at a time of crisis for the labor movement, one that calls upon all of us in the labor movement to contribute toward resolution of the crisis.

This is not the first time I have had the pleasure of dealing with this meeting, the annual meeting of the AFL-CIO union educators. The first was about five years ago. Some of you were there. I am sure it made a more indelible impression on me than on you because it was the first time I had addressed a union group after the restructuring of the field operations of the AFL-CIO. I felt, at the time, it was significant that the first group that I would meet as Director of that new department was with those whose responsibility it was in the labor movement to help educate. At that meeting I projected some basic programs, prospects and problems. One of the problems I discussed with you was the problem of the growing opposition to the labor movement -- growing in intensity, growing in the comprehensive character of its operations, growing in the method of financing, growing in terms of the courage, if that's the proper term, the gall with which they are now beginning to take on the labor movement in many, many areas of our activity -- legislative, political, collective bargaining, organizing, attitudinal. They were out after us. It was involving every kind of union, building trades, industrial unions, retail, service, white collar, blue collar and in both the private and the public sector.

Now that projection has come true. It is a reality, not just prospect. There have been times when I felt like Cassandra as to the effect my warnings were having. I am sure for many it seemed like "more of the same." But the fact is that it is not "more of the same." It is now a full-blown scale. It is now almost totally pervasive throughout our total society. You can scarcely pick up an article in a magazine or a newspaper that does not contain either an account or an inference that the decline of the labor movement, which has long trumpeted by those who proclaim to be students of the labor movement, is now full-blown.

Now, where before, there were these intermittent comments and reports, it is now like a Greek chorus. It is constant. It is everywhere. Now they have evidence to which they can point, not just their own subjective evaluation, now they have some objective evidence to which they refer. They point to NLRB elections and they have something to point to. There was a time when employees in elections conducted by the NLRB voted for collective bargaining 80 percent of the time. Then it became 70 percent and then 65 percent and 60 percent and 55 percent and then for several years we hovered around that 50 percent line. We occasionally dipped but we were able to say then: "No matter what, the fact continues to remain that most workers vote for collective bargaining." We cannot say that anymore because we have dipped below the line and we are staying below it even though we may have leveled out a bit. The fact is that it is now the case more than it is not that the workers in elections are not voting for collective bargaining. Our critics point to a second statistic -- the percentage of the workforce that is organized. They draw these charts that show the steady decline, every two years, for the most part uninterrupted, so that even by our own figures, even when we toss out of the statistics of the workforce those categories we consider to be not potentially organizable, the fact remains there has been a decline in the percentage of the working population now covered by collective bargaining contracts.

They point to the industries that have been organized and the changes in the working arrangements of the United States and they say, "Well, of course, they are declining because they stay with what they have. The labor movement stays where it is comfortable. It stays in the industries it has already organized and it is not reaching out to new groups. It is not reaching out to the young, to the women, to the minorities and to the emerging white-collar unorganized groups." And they say, "Of course, as a result it has lost and is losing its power and its prestige and its ability to deliver for its members on the collective bargaining front, on the legislative front, and on the political front." And they point to what happened last year in labor law reform, the year before in situs picketing, the year before that, on the cargo trade legislation and they say "All the evidence is there."

But we can take the evidence and we can ask ourselves, "Why?" Why is it that these points of verification actually do exist? Well, they are very happy to provide us with the reasons. They say that unions are no longer active in organizing; unions are satisfied, complacent, not interested, not pursuaded as to the necessity of allocating more resources to organizing.

Secondly, they say that the organizers have lost their touch; they are not competent; they are not informed; they don't relate to the new workers; they continue to dig coal in Illinois instead of recognizing there are computer programmers. And furthermore, they are not up to it anymore, they don't have the zeal, they don't have enthusiasm, they don't have the dedication, they are not that interested.

The third category of reasons these observers happily supply to us is that really the workers are no longer interested. They are better educated, they are more capable of controlling their own destinies, they have better insight, they realize they don't need an intermediary.

The labor movement is like the dodo, an extinct species, an entity that dies long before it realized it was dead. It's one of those institutions whose day has come and gone. Workers understand this and so they are just not responding anymore to the appeals which are themselves outdated.

My answer to all these reasons is a resounding "NO." That is not the answer. It is not the case that unions are allocating a smaller portion of their resources to organizing. They are allocating more. There are more staff. There is more material, and there is more effort in organizing today. It is not the case that organizers are now lacking in competence or dedication or skills or knowledge or willingness or energy. I know more organizers than any person in the labor movement. There is no challenge to that statement. It has nothing to do with me; it happens to do with the jobs that I have had. Anyone who had these jobs could make the same statement. I know that they are competent, they are skillful and they are dedicated, hardworking and keep abreast of what is taking place and they bleed just as they always did when they lose. They don't believe there is any virtue in losing. They experience the heartbreak that comes when the campaign is lost, not because it's another minus mark against but because another group of workers has been denied the opportunity of collective bargaining.

As to the question as to whether the workers are interested, I know that is not true. Because every bit of evidence that we can muster indicates that when the workers have a free choice they choose collective bargaining. Why wouldn't they? They are intelligent. They are better educated. They are more perceptive and they do have insights. And they know their own conditions. They do not have free choice. That makes the difference. How is it that they do not have a free choice? There are laws.

There are agencies. There is tradition. There is policy of the United States. It says that they have free choice. Not only that, our whole democratic structure is based upon free choice. You don't need a piece of legislation to give free choice to workers. You don't need a constitution to give it to workers. You don't need the British common law. You don't need Magna Carta. It's ingrained in the very nature of man, freely to associate for common purposes. How can it be said, then that they do not have free choice and that the conditions are not there for them to exercise their rights?

Well, some other changes have occured and I think they bear upon the issue. If you were to analyze the House of Representatives today, its makeup, you would find that 55 percent of the members of the House were not in the House when we first met five years ago. In five years, more than half have come and gone. Fifty-five percent, at the most, have served two terms and some only one. The Senate has also changed, not to our benefit. Out in the states what has happened in State legislative elections is even more ominous because there, state after state, the state houses, the legislative assemblies have, become in our terms, more conservative. It's being reflected this very day in the kind of legislation that is coming down the pike and that is not coming down from the legislators. It's reflected in the fact that his year in eleven states right-to-work legislation was introduced. In states like West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New England. I am not talking about the states like New Mexico that has been a cliffhanger for months.

Some other things have happened. There has been now emerging as the fastest growth industry, the labor-management consultant. We talked about them five years ago and five years before that those of you who attended the AFL-CIO Convention will recall that in the weekend recess when the committees met we had an organizing conference that was attended by about 250 of the delegates representing about 70 AFL-CIO unions. And we projected on the screen using an overhead projector the network of labor-management consultants that was being formed. And we said then, 10 years ago, that some years back if we had projected on the screen a map of the United States with the location of labor-management consultant firms the screen would have been fairly uncluttered. But then we put on the screen the location of labor-management consultants and there were alot of spots on the map. If we were to project today it would look solid. There is not a city, a county, a state that is not affected by the activities of the labor-management consultants today. They are professional union busters constituting a network of opposition that operates first to thwart the growth and secondly to eliminate that which already exists. Their techniques are built on an overwhelming antagonism by management to collective bargaining. Their watchword is a union-free environment.

It was not by accident that that new NAM committee adopted that name - Council for Union Free Environment. There is kind of a candor there; an honesty among thieves to let us know what they had in mind -- a union-free environment. Now there is nothing new. It has been there all the time. At least two chairmen of the National Labor Relations Board publicly expressed their dismay over the years, one a Republican, Boyd Leedham, a conservative, nay, reactionary Judge from the Dakotas who by his self definition lacked any sense of desire to see unions grow; the other a Democrat, Frank McCullock, a liberal. Both, from their vantage point of commitment to law and national policy publicly deplored the persistence and growth in the management community of the large segment dedicated to resisting the national labor policy. But what sets this current configuration of opposition apart from what's gone on in the past is the institutionalized way in which the opposition now operates and in which the art of unionbusting is being promulgated.

Millions of dollars are expended every year. And that begins to get down to the nub of it. Last year at the Executive Council Meeting, President Meany was asked, "Why do you think there is this resurgence of this attitude?" He answered it in one word, "Greed!" It gets down to money and it is the money that has proven to be the common ingredient that makes their operations effective. They had all the elements to be really overwhelmingly effective but somehow they were not putting it together because the cement -- the money -- wasn't there. But they have developed the money-raising process so that now they have it and they have their act together. Secondly, an apparent change in public attitude around the country has emboldened anti-union employers to come out of the closet and to begin openly to express their opposition and to launch what the Secretary-Treasurer, Lane Kirkland, has properly termed "class warfare."

Now, how do they do it? Well, they publish scholarly papers in respectable journals, the point of which is to say, as I indicated earlier, the time is past for unions to play any meaningful role. They conduct seminars all over the country in how to block the unions, and if you've committed the sin of letting them in, how to repent and sin no more and get rid of them. There are business groups who sponsor these seminars and universities and law schools, some of them give credit on these continuing education programs to those who participate. They use tax money right out of the pockets of our members to develop programs to cripple our members' unions. They use some of the same tax dollars, (these business associations) for training programs -- scab training programs -- to help eliminate the presence of unions in our economy. They have do-it-yourself books, manuals, brochures, pamphlets, letters, that they send and sell. They have professional staff who are available to go into the plant and into the homes. One of the firms, Modern Management Methods, which some of you are familiar, operates all over the country as do some of the law firms like Seafarth and Shaw and they charge very substantial sums, $500-$700 per day per staff to thwart the organizing effort.

So, what are the results? The results are election loses. The results are a jump in the number of unfair labor practices. That latter statement is a statistic our friends do not bother with when they report changes. Every organizer knows, today, the minute he steps forward into the arena, that before that campaign is over there will be 2½ as many unfair labor practices committed against those workers than there would have been ten years ago. And what is it that they commit most of the time? It is the 8(a)3 discharge, the illegal discharge - a brutal assault upon a worker and his family -- and they do it because it is effective.

The second result is the phenomenal increase in decertification and the deauthorization elections that are being conducted.

In 1967, the National Labor Relations Board conducted 267 such elections and in 1977, 991, a four-fold increase. Now they have seminars specifically focused on the art of decertification and deauthorization and those statistics are going to go out of sight. One out of every nine elections the NLRB conducts is a decertification or a deauthorization election, elections not to get union representation but to eliminate it. Ten percent of the total time and energy and effort of the agency designed by the Congress to facilitate collective bargaining is being used to destroy it today! It has been turned around -- truth upside down, policy demolished and it is due in large measure to the activities of this wrecking crew known as labor-management consultants.

How do we deal with it? What is the AFL-CIO to do? Well, we now recognize that it is a problem of such critical character that it requires special emphasis. The Executive Council at its meeting last month focused on it. The session of the Council that had the most lengthy discussion and in which more members of the Council participated was that dealing with labor-management consultants.

The Department of Organization and Field Services has now not just a general but a specific mandate from the AFL-CIO to deal with this problem and to help the unions deal with it.

Two years ago we had established a national organizing coordinating committee which is made up of the directors of organization of unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO and that committee appointed a subcommittee on labor-management consultants that now is very active and we are attempting now to develop the kind of information that unions need to deal with labor-management consultants. They have to be dealt with on many fronts, with the National Labor Relations Board, with the Bar, with literature. But where the labor-management consultants are confronting us is in the organizing effort. That is where the pay dirt is, that is where the payoff occurs and it is there that we must deal with them immediately. The union organizer needs help. The union for whom he works needs help to deal with the labor-management consultants and we are attempting to develop the kind of information that will enable us to keep tabs on the activities of the consultants, on the universities, on the associations and on the law firms.

We want to identify them, their names, their clients, their campaign tactics, their literature, how they operate, what their standard operating procedures are. We are well on our way to developing that kind of collection of material, thanks to the directors of organization who formed this committee. There is now flowing material, information, evidence about the labor-management consultants. We now have collected and catalogued information on 120 firms who are engaged full-time in the art of union busting We have information on more than 150 individuals who either have their own one-man operation or who work for these firms on a retainer basis. But it is just the tip of the iceberg. If we are going to establish a truly effective offensive, we need information that goes beyond what the organizing directors can provide. So, we have reached out. The Executive Council is reaching out to every department of the AFL-CIO and to every union to Education, to COPE, to Legislation, to Public Relations, for the kind of support and insight that it takes to expand the consciousness of our union membership concerning the scope and dimension of the labor-management consultants problem.

We have to reach out to central bodies; we have to have watchdog committees, not just for price changes but for the activities of the labor-management consultants. Wherever they operate we must know of it and we must be there; our physical presence must be there. We have to expand and elevate the sense of the danger that is there.

Where do you fit into the picture? We have also a subcommittee on the training of organizers in the task of dealing with the labor-management consultant in the field. Organizers should be better equipped in terms of communication skills, knowledge, in analytical skills, in the processes of attitudinal change. And who better than those who have for the labor movement, for unions, the responsibility for developing those skills and insight, than those whom we call labor educators.

You develop training programs for your international unions. In those training programs there should be a component on labor-management consultants, on the new opposition, running through the programs so that your members, not just your staff, but your members are aware of the crisis we face. You have summer schools, you have special programs and there should be in them a determined effort not to let a single participant leave without having his or her consciousness of the crisis increased and the techniques of teaching people to deal with problems. You have them and you must impart them to organizers because it is a sophisticated as well as a crude opposition.

Organizers must be just as sophisticated in their insights into, for example, the process of decision making in small groups. They must know all the methods and the movements by which people who are joined by some bond, like that of working for the same boss, develop within themselves leadership. You must help union organizers develop their skills in detecting indigenous leadership and in developing it and in expanding the leadership base. These are your skills; they must be drawn upon. We are going to be asking for you to join with us in this absolutely essential job of stopping those who would murder collective bargaining in the United States.

William E. Roehl,
Assistant Director,
Department of Organization and
Field Services, AFL-CIO

Organizing Training Programs

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak to you this morning about the Department of Organization and Field Services organizing training programs.

One of my areas of responsibility in our Department is to develop training seminars and present such programs, upon request, to our international union affiliates.

There are a great number of problem areas in organizing in today's work place. Some of these have been mentioned, economic, labor management consultants, changes in the work force and others.

A major problem in the organizing process is the lack of methodical, systematic approach to organizing. We feel that this is the most correctable of all others. The training seminars we present addresses this particular problem directly.

This organizing training program has been developed with the assistance of organizing directors and input from our field staff over a long period and respond to the needs of organizers who are involved, in the trenches in direct organizing. The awareness of our affiliates of the pressing need to intensify organizing efforts is clearly indicated by the ever-increasing requests for these graining seminars.

I am sure that most of you are aware, that the George Meany Center for Labor Studies has an organizing training seminar our department worked very closely in that development also.

Before launching into the content of training programs I would like to explain our method of presentation and the physical arrangement of the participants.

We use discussion techniques in our presentation because we feel strongly that this requires a high level of involvement. We judicially avoid answering questions and the effective discussion demands that the answers emanate from the people. Most of these answers have been pre-determined by the instructor.

The physical layout for our sessions requires placing the participants at tables arranged in the shape of a "U" with a blackboard at the open end. The instructor works in the interior of the "U", posing questions. This arrangement affords the instructor an open field in which to question anyone of the participants at anytime. This is a mild form of intimid[illegible] that results in a greater degree of attention for longer periods.

The subject matter in a typical program inc[illegible]s the following:

I. Network of opposition and general organizing figures on national bases.

II. Organizer qualifications - This session helps define the multifaceted skills needed by the organizer. Reinforces the importance of the organizer to the organizing campaign and established the need for an analytical approach to each situation at every stage.

III. The Survey - This discussion involves the necessity of obtaining facts not only about the organizing target but the community as well. Stresses the need for searching for sources of aid as well as recognizing potential areas of opposition.

IV. Initial contact of workers - This area is concerned with why workers are contacted. These contacts designed for specific purposes, developing issues, potential leadership, giving and receiving information. In this phase added emphasis is placed on the importance of recordkeeping

V. Building In-plant Committees - This session is extremely important and deals with the ability of the organizer to seek out leadership and to educate, motivate and lead the committee. To involve the committee in meaningful activity and direct toward recognizable and obtainable goals. To have the committee understand and answer antiunion propaganda, help develop literature and assist in every aspect of the campaign.

VI. Diagramming and Slotting - Discussing the diagramming process from a general outline of the work facility to a fairly detailed blueprint that gives the organizer at least as good a knowledge of the plant, its operations and the employees, as that held by management. The diagram is drawn up with the assistance of the committee and is the key to perceiving whether an in-plant committee is truly representative, sufficiently influential, adequately mobile. Diagramming points out the holes in a campaign effort and enables the organizer to keep working back into his outline, to overcome the defects that the diagram discloses. The diagram enables the organizer to keep in-plant committee members productively involved and supplies the organizer with justification for the basic and timing of the campaign.

VII. Company Opposition - This session outlines the opposition that can be expected from the company. The use of anxiety producing terms such as strike, loss of individual freedom, outsiders, dues and a number of others. We discuss what to expect and how to deal with these destructive management approaches with some references to labor management consultants.

VIII. Communication - This session involves verbal and written communications, including leaflets, letters, home contacts and meetings. With special emphasis on the use of the media in our organizing efforts.

The program is designed to follow a logical sequence, each session dovetailing with the next - bringing into focus the fact that organizing at its best is conducted in a conflict situation and that the responsiblity of the organizer to the workers being organized is to conduct that campaign in the most systematic methodical way possible so as to increase the possibility of winning.

Jack Adams,
Retail Clerks
International Union

Staff Training

Organizing is the lifeblood of the Retail Clerks International Union. The training of our new International Representatives has always had top priority in our organization. Last year we organized 44,000 people. With store closings, layoffs, and turnovers, we are lucky to net 10,000 members out of the 44,000 organized.

The question is what if we hadn't organized. Obviously we would have lost members. We have had a gain consecutively for the last 36 years -- some were large gains, some were small gains; but the point is we have gained every year. We spend a great deal of money on organizing the unorganized.

We have nine division offices throughout the United States and Canada. Each division office has an organizing director, executive assistant organizing director, collective bargaining representative, two field assistants, membership service representative and a staff of eight International representatives. Besides the divisional personnel we also have various financial assistant programs which provides additional help to the local unions where we contribute financial assistance. One of these programs is called back-to-back organizing, which means we pay half the cost for the hiring of a new representative who must be used for organizing, and the local pays the other half of the cost. The program is for a twelve week period and is subject to renewal after twelve weeks based on the productivity of the program.

We have a manpower subsidy program. A manpower subsidy is when the International joins wholly or partially with the local union in subsidizing a man or a woman for a specific period of time to work on a specific program.

We also have a servicing subsidy. The only difference between organizing and servicing back-to-back programs is that the servicing representatives are to be used exclusively for servicing.

That basically is our subsidy program, other than the strike and informational picketing subsidies.

In the training of new representatives we give them a loose-leaf notebooks to study when they are hired. In this notebook are International policies that will effect him or her. I have a list of probably thirty two items that go into this notebook. I am not going to read them all because I would imagine, most unions here have the same policies; included in this notebook are the vacation policies, the use of the 5th Amendment, adherence to the AFL-CIO Code of Ethical Practices, authorization cards and the purpose of the card, our annuity plan, our out-of-town assignments and joint petitions with other labor unions.

We also give them a booklet on the history of our organization and the NLRB Guide which is a layman's guide to procedures that is easy to understand.

The first week of the indoctrination course is spent with the division director or the executive assistant of the division. The representative learns the operation of a division office, what their responsibilities and authorities are going to be, how to get along with local union executive officers and staff, while working in the local. The representatives must learn how to conduct themselves and the fact that they are there to help the local and the membership without getting involved in local politics.

During the second and third week the representative is assigned to a training local. We have two in each division. In this two-week period they work with the business representative and learn the correct procedures in handling grievances and other services provided by a business representative. They also learn about office administration, dues structure, how to handle different problems in the local union, how to respond to phone calls from members and the importance of answering the calls promptly.

We have a trial period of six months for a new representative. After the trial period has elasped we then bring the representatives to Washington (our International headquarters) for a three-day indoctrination program. In the meantime between the third week and the six-month period they have worked with an experienced organizer. Generally the new representative has not run a program himself, but is working with the seasoned organizer. At the six-month period when the representative is brought into the International office, we familiarize him or her with the President's office, Secretary-Treasurer's office, the Legal Department, the Organizing Department, the Footwear Division, the Professional and Health Care Division, International Affairs Department, and the Membership Benefits Department, which deals with contracts, fringe benefits and education and research, also the Accounting Department and the Data Processing Department.

The representative learns the responsibilities of each department, how they operate, and what services they provide, so that when the representative is organizing in the field, he can contact the International office and seek help from these department. That is basically the program up to the six-month period.

I just want to stress some of the characteristics that I think a good organizer has to develop. If you don't teach an organizer good basic work habits in the beginning, they will never display good work habits throughout their organizing career. You must teach the basics properly. The representatives must be taught to have faith in the organization and we all have to have faith in unionism. The representative has to believe in what they are doing and believe in helping people. If you make a contact on a person that you are trying to organize even if you are the most knowledgeable person in the world who knows board procedures, all the little techniques about organizing, contract interpretation and all of these things, you can even have the issues downpat, and know what they want to hear, but if you are not sincere in what you are trying to do you will never get it across to the people. They will spot you as a phony.

We teach an organizer how to complete a home call. He should know what should be presented in a home call, what the issues are, what to do if the TV is on, what to do if the person is not listening and how to react to this type of thing. Also, the organizer needs to know where the best place is to talk -- in the living room or the kitchen, what happens if they won't let him or her in the door, how does he or she react to this situation.

Self-motivation is important as many times an organizer is working on his own. The representative may be in a motel and a TV program comes on that he likes. It is easy for the organizer to sit back after he has had supper and his stomach is full to relax and watch his favorite TV program instead of making homecalls or going to the store, the plant or wherever he is trying to organize and talk to the people. So, you need self-motivation and discipline.

An organizer must learn how to write a good piece of literature. They learn this through seminars we hold and also through experience while working on the programs. It takes time to learn to write good literature.

Strikes. The organizer has to learn how to handle a strike. Many times one of our International representatives is assigned to a strike, especially a major strike. The representatives have to learn how to protect those members on the picket line, how to take the brunt of the criticism from police and take it away from the membership. We are there to protect them.

The organizer needs to learn about board procedures -- how to file a petition, what is the proper language to use. It costs at least $75.00 to have an attorney file a petition. You can file one yourself in five minutes.

Evaluating people is one of the most difficult things to teach an organizer. How do you evaluate people you are trying to organize? Getting down to the election date you try to evaluate your program to see where you stand -- are you going to win the election or are you going to lose it. Teaching the organizers to evaluate people and be sensitive to people, know their feelings and their reactions, is very important.

Meetings. We teach the organizers how to prepare and conduct meetings. At these meetings or on home calls you develop key people and we all know that key people are essential to any organizing program. However, sometimes an organizer depends too much on the keys. They get lazy. We have lost many a program where the organizers let the keys do all the work and the organizer did very little and we lost the program. I can remember one program where we had the majority of the unit at the meeting every week clear up to the election date. The organizers figured since the majority was there, and we have talked to them all this time, we will win the election. Well, the organizers lost the election 2 to 1. Why? Because some of those employees who were at the meeting every week may have been too scared to ask questions. The organizers really didn't get their true feelings. It wasn't a one-on-one situation. The organizers did nothing all week because they had a majority at the meeting every week. They did other things besides organizing. They sat around the motel and did nothing until the meeting was held the next week, instead of getting out and making a few more calls to see if the people at the meetings were well informed or pleased with having a union. They should have found out if the people had any questions that weren't presented at the meetings. The organizers could have contacted the employees at the place of business, passed out literature, phone called them, and had a thorough discussion of the issues. This could have changed the whole program. They had it won and lost it.

We must realize too, that an organizer has fears. Some have a fear of organizing. Example. There was a organizer whom we had hired when I was on the State Council. We were trying to organize a large department store and needed authorization cards. I told the organizer to sit in the snack bar area of the store and approach the employees during their lunch hour and breaks to have them sign authorization cards. (I didn't find out what had happened until six months later when the organizer and I were just sitting around talking and I wanted to find out how he was doing."

The organizer said to me, "you know Jack, when you assigned me to go into the store and try to sign up those people, I went and sat in my car for two hours because I was scared to do it. I was scared to sit in a snack bar and get up when somebody came in and try to talk union to them. I was afraid that management would come in and try to harrass me." All these thoughts went through his mind. He sat in the car and finally said to himself, if I am going to be an organizer then I am going to have to do what is necessary. I will have to develop courage. So, after those two hours, he went into the snack bar and worked the snack bar for four hours and came out with 25 signed authorization cards.

Courage, in my definition, is doing something when you are scared. When a man is scared and he does whatever he has to, that's courage.

Some of these new organizers can teach you just as much as the old ones. I learned from that man. I didn't know there was that kind of fear as I had been organizing for a lot of years. I had made a lot of snack bars, a lot of restaurants, and a lot of parking lots. But I never knew how he felt until he told me.

We must recognize fear in organizers and we need to cover those areas. Even home calling;some organizers are scared to home call. Sometimes when they tell you at a meeting that we shouldn't do this, it is not because they think it is wrong, but they use this as a shield because they are scared to do it.

Seminars for the organizers are held at the International office, at colleges and divisional offices. When I was in the Eastern Division, we held one seminar in which we prepared a booklet and gave it to the organizers. The booklet covered how to make verbal demands for recognition agreement if the employer wants to give you a card check, authorization and certification of the card check, and employees' petition for expediting the election, which we use sometimes. An example of the employees' petition for expediting the election is "we the undersigned employees petition the NLRB to expedite the petition that our union has filed." It does nothing. The Board doesn't pay any attention to it but it does keep interest up among the employees you are trying to organize. It's one little thing that keeps the spirits up especially when charges have been filed and there is a delay.

The booklet also included principle decisions of NLRB cases affecting the organizers, some of the cases over the years that have affected organizing, and how would these cases matter to the particular program the organizer is working on.

Also covered in the booklet were the ABC's of election procedures, the difference between the stipulation consent or a consent election, telephone contact, meetings, and evaluations.

In the back of the booklet were sample charges, sample petitions, the proper language to use in petitions and charges, plus different forms from the NLRB that the organizers may come across in their career.

All of the information in the booklet is primarily used by the organizers. But it can also be helpful to the local unions for their staff. The importance of the information in the booklet is for reference when the organizer needs it. All the subjects covered are good basic information.

Thank you.

Bruce Raynor, Associate Education Director,
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile
Workers Union

"J.P. STEVENS ORGANIZING CAMPAIGN"

ACTWU does a lot of organizing training in all branches of the industry, but I am going to talk a little bit about the J.P. Stevens Campaign, which one or two of you may have heard about. This campaign is naturally very special and different from normal organizing campaigns. We have been at it for 16 years; we have held 12 elections at Stevens' plants; we've won one and we've had 11 of them set aside. Stevens commited more unfair labor practices than any other company in the history of the country. Over the years we have pursued various organizing strategies. The most recent strategy that the union has pursued began after we won the last election in 1974 and the company refused to bargain in good faith for 4½ years and continued to commit flagrant unfair labor practices. Our organizers -- we have about 20 of them -- were assigned to try to build majorities in Stevens plants and to take advantage of the company's unfair labor practices, in order to get Section 8 (a) 5 bargaining orders from the NLRB. Mainly, we were signing union cards, trying to build majorities and counting on the company to commit unfair labor practices. That strategy was successful in getting perhaps four (4) bargaining orders covering about 8 or 9 plants.

In the last year and a half the company has adopted a new strategy and the union has had to respond to that. The NLRB has become very reluctant to issue complaints against the company and we have had a series of what we felt were legitimate complaints thrown out. So we have had to pursue a different strategy along with our boycott and all the other tactics I think most of you are well aware of, which involves a new kind of organizing approach. We quickly built up our staff to its present strength of about 45 to 50 organizers assigned to Stevens' over 80 plants. That sounds like a lot of people, but when you consider that some of the plants have anywhere from 1,000 to 2,000 workers, it takes a large staff -- certainly more than we have had. I think we are still currently understaffed.

The strategy that we developed was to try to build local unions within the Stevens chain and to try to attack the company on issues inside the plant. Also, we try to build strong organizing committees inside plants to take advantage of union contract provisions and to take advantage of the concerted activity that's protected under the NLRB. We have also gotten remedies from the courts that make the labor reform bill that we lost, look sick; we have access to the plants, we have access to the parking lots, we have an up-to-date list of every employee's name and address: when the company commits a violation, it gets fined $5,000.00 a day (the only problem is, they won't be found guilty): we have access to the bulletin boards and all those kinds of things. Rightly or wrongly, we built up the staff very quickly, with people who were donated by different international unions to the Stevens campaign, with some of our existing organizers, with some dedicated young people who were hired by the union, and with some people with civil rights movement experience.

We had to convince these people of the value of our strategy and to try to get them to carry it out. We did this in a number of different ways.

First we started with a series of training sessions using video tape equipment. This first part was moderately successful. We made video tapes of various presentations by union officials on occupational safety and health, cotton dust, industrial engineering and workload problems in textile plants, social services and social service problems that textile workers face. In small group meetings in hotels with five or six organizers, we would show the video tapes, have discussions and try to apply what was in the presentation to the campaigns that the specific organizers were working on.

But this proved to be time-consuming, and the officials who made the presentations and who did a very good job, were more difficult to listen to on video tape than they would have been in person. So we still had to come up with a new approach to training staff. We still have no magic formulas for success; but if we ever find one, the labor movement is going to crack the problem of organizing.

I will tell you what we have done that we think is at least moderately successful. Our 50 organizers are dispersed throughout three states: North and South Carolina and Georgia. What we did was, to hold two-day seminars in these states, one in each state, every month. In each of these seminars we had about 15 new organizers. We discussed a variety of subjects. We talked about the economics of the industry and the manufactoring processes, we showed films, including the old AFL-CIO series on the Union at Work and some films of new mills, and we discussed the problems workers face in each job. We talked about the Union's history of collective bargaining in the textile industry, the current status of bargaining in the industry, and we took four union contracts and put them into a booklet form. We had long discussions about the rights on the shop floor that these workers get, the various provisions of the contract (e.g.) the job bidding procedure, seniority and how it works (in a union plant as opposed to a Stevens plant) showing how those issues could be used and how we could raise issues which are more important than money and benefits.

We talked about the union's strategy in the Stevens Campaign for building committees; for instance, if leaflets are done they are handed out by the committee; organizers are virtually not allowed to hand out leaflets. We talked about these kinds of things. We took articles and sent them out to the organizers to read in advance so we could have a discussion of the articles in the seminars. It was interesting; of course, as everyone knows no one read them, but when they got there we would discuss it and then we would get the staff to read them.

One we took was from an anti-union journal - which Bill Roehl and Alan Kistler mentioned earlier; it was an article saying that companies pursuing anti-union policies should not adopt a grievance procedure because the union can turn it to its benefit. This is just the strategy we have in the Stevens campaign. We took that article and we tried to show the organizers how we could turn Stevens' anti-union grievance procedure to our advantage. Then we tried to tie our discussions to the specific campaigns people were involved in, determining what experiences they had and how to use them. We had one seminar where we would discuss something and then they would come back for the next to say if it worked, or not.

Also, we took Joint Board Managers who service our Southern Local unions and we put them into seminars about what kinds of grievances they have in their plants. It stands to reason that the same grievances in an organized textile plant would be the grievances in an unorganized plant. Therefore, we took grievances where we could show various accomplishments of the union, through arbitration, through the grievance procedure in solving such problems. We tried to apply those very same procedures to those grievances raised in the organizing campaign. That worked fairly successfully.

During the same period of time we had these seminars once a month, we would take all the probationary organizers; we've got a staff union like some of the rest of you have -- and we have a probationary period of six months and all the newer organizers needed to have a meeting to learn how to write a leaflet. We taught organizers not to sit in a motel room writing a leaflet, but to take the committee and write a leaflet together. By having the committee write the leaflet -- having things in there that sometimes you don't want in but that the committee does -- you are actually giving the committee control over what issues are going to be raised and how they are going to be put. We would tell that to the probationary staff and we would also do role playing on house calls to show how we answer issues in an organizing campaign.

The final aspect of the Stevens Organizing Training Program, which I think is probably the most exciting, is taking people out of our shops in groups of about ten at a time from the organized plants. We took them mostly from the south but also from other areas as well and put them on a lost time basis for eight weeks. We have done this, as most internationals have over the years. What was different about this program was they would come out for eight weeks, paid by their local unions, and we would take them and put them through 3-day organizing-training sessions called worker-to-worker programs.

We started these programs about a year ago. Here we could train people how to make house calls through role playing. We would have them role play with each other and we discovered that it was good to test people by having a couple of experienced organizers do the role playing; so then we would play one part and have one of the people out of the shops do the other part. Sometimes we would use video tapes so they could see themselves making the house call,and see what discussion might take place. We use these house calls to raise all the issues that we would normally develop in a lecture to new organizers. For example, what do you say when the company raises the issue of strikes? What do you say when the company raises the issue of dues? The boycott? And all the other problems we experience in the Stevens campaign, instead of talking to them about it we would raise these in the house calls. For instance, we asked Harold McIver to assist in this program. I remember when Harold set up a house call where he raised the issue of the 1934 General strike, and all the workers who got killed in a particular town. This is an issue we hear about all the time in the Stevens campaign. Instead of explaining it to people in a lecture on how to answer that, Harold raised it by playing the worker in the house call, and the person would have to try to come up with an answer to that. Then the group would discuss what was right and what was wrong with the answer they came up with, rather than have us try to deliver lectures about what to say when the company raises this issue.

We talk about the history of the campaign. We have role playing about plant access -- how to go into a company break area and meet workers, and how to do that at the same time without ruining their breaks, which is a difficult thing to do. We try to teach those new people how to listen in a house call (which seems to be something that a lot of us have difficulty doing at any time,) instead of going in and delivering a speech. Even experienced organizers will often go in and talk instead of listening, and we try to encourage listening among these newer people.

After these 3-day sessions, we would send people in to the field with the organizers assigned to a particular campaign. Four weeks later we bring them back for a one day seminar, and we discuss what problems they encountered. That fourth week we teach them how to write a leaflet with the committee.

In the remaining four weeks, we go out and spend a day or two in the field with people to house visit, to watch them run a committee meeting and to discuss how they ran committee meetings afterwards. We told them what they did right, what they did wrong, or what they might have done instead.

At the end of eight weeks, the participants returned for a seminar, in which they evaluated themselves, us and the campaign they worked in.

Out of this worker-to-worker program, we have hired some of the best organizers we have anywhere in the union.

We have not only put new spirit into the organizing campaign with these people, but they seem to have more of a stake in ACTWU and even much more in the Steven's campaign. The anti-union committees at the Steven's plant cannot say to them, "You are a professional organizer making $30,000 a year." A worker-to-worker organizer can reply, "We do not earn $30,000 a year but some of your anti-union staff members do." Since they work directly in the plant, they can answer the question, "who are you with?" "I am Pete Rose and I work in Rock Hill, South Carolina, my union sent me here to talk with you."

This programs has been both successful in aiding our campaign and developing some new talent for our organizing staff.

We certainly haven't solved the problem of how to train organizers, but we feel that our approaches have had some degree of success, and we expect to see the complete organization of this renegade textile company in the near future.

Saul Nesselroth, Associate Professor,
Labor Education Center,
University of Connecticut

Organizing Training Programs

I have been asked to discuss labor education programs in the area of oganizing the unorganized. I had planned to discuss a recent session with a regional organizing staff of the Machinist's Union. At the social hour last night, I was talking shop with a number of people; and a Steelworker rep reminded me of a program our Center conducted a few years ago during the organizing of a firm in his industry. I'd like to tell you about both of these programs, which demonstrate the value of labor education in the organizing process.

I don't think that labor education can give organizers the basic motivation necessary to carry out that vital task. A belief that all workers really want to join a union, and that only fear and/or ignorance prevents their joining, must exist within the organizer. We can, however, sharpen some skills and possibly add a few tools to their kit. Labor education techniques of group discussion, role playing and problem solving can also help people reflect and reexamine the activities and methods that they are presently employing, and help them gain some knowledge from the academic disciplines. Since the organizer is so totally involved in the job at hand, the luxury of spending a few hours or days viewing that job from different perspectives can be labor education's most valuable contribution. Organizers rarely have the opportunity to think about techniques within a structured framework, and they have even less opportunity to explore the information that has been developed and recorded by the behavioral and social sciences.

The Machinists Union district education director asked me to present a session on motivating workers to organize as part of a more extensive program that they gave their staff organizers. I first thought of offering various motivational theories but wondered about their utility in a short presentation.

When I walked into the conference center the night before class, staffers were discussing the difficulty of getting a handle on younger workers. This was the ideal opening for the session I had planned.

I was able to get poll data from the University of Connecticut, Social

Science Data Center (Roper Center), on the attitude of workers toward business, unions and government as represented by a number of polls. We broke out the data by age, sex, occupation, income and region. Pollsters had also probed attitudes toward work, leisure and self-identification. We discussed changes in attitude and self-image over the past dozen years. Important insights were gained by taking rankings of campaign issues used by unions and by managements in representative elections and comparing those rankings against the poll data.[1] We found that appeals made to non-union workers often were based on outdated attitudes. Unions didn't always address the needs of those to be organized. Respondents, especially younger workers, seem to have different attitudes from older workers; they are placing leisure activities ahead of work activities. Significant numbers identify themselves by their hobbies; unions are dealing with bowlers, bikers and fisherman, rather than welders and machinists. Discussions revolved around these concepts, changing the approach and tactics of the organizer, and the issues and campaign strategy they employ While the staff organizer didn't make any firm decisions on changing their campaign strategy, it did force them to think about new paths and to evaluate their present conduct in light of these data. It also gave them ideas for obtaining useful data about target groups. The public's low opinion of unions as shown by the polls was less discouraging when measured against an even lower opinion of business and the political system. This led to discussion on whether poeple vote for or against issues and candidates, and whether a positive or negative campaign was best.

Participants felt that structured discussion based on more-or-less valid information such as poll data and union election issue analysis was more valuable than the usual midnight motel room organizing sessions. Most concluded that it was because it gave them, as one organizer said, "a different angle on where people are."

Labor education can also provide services to unions and to workers during organizing campaigns. Weekly committee membership meetings often get stale because of the repetitive reports, speeches and occasional films and guest speakers. Using traditional adult education "simulation" approaches, the organizing committees can be educated in the negotiating and grievance processes by demonstration rather than lecture.

---

[1] Getman, Goldberg and Herman, Union Representation Elections

A number of years ago, we were asked to present classes to show an organizing committee how a local union functions. The committee of about forty workers was involved in the organization of a plant of several thousand potential members of the Steelworkers' Union. Through the use of discussion and lecture, the stage was set for mock negotiating sessions. Grievance, safety, layoff, seniority and other clauses were "negotiated" over a number of weeks. The role of negotiating committee members in the process was emphasized. Short segments of these sessions were devoted to organizing law, labor history, notices and news of the campaign.

After working out sample language, a 'steward' system was established and problems in the various departments of the plant were processed as though a union contract were in place. Non-committee workers with problems were encouraged to come to the meeting and learn how problems would be settled after the union was voted into place. The abstract concepts represented by the organizers were brought to life in role play situations.

This particular series continued over a number of months and it produced the fringe benefit of helping build a knowledgeable leadership for the negotiating committee, steward system and it also gave an opportunity to potential officers to learn and demonstrate skills. After the NLRB election was won by the union, the class participants provided an almost ready-made electable union structure.

University and union staff labor educators have an important role in promoting knowledge about the collective bargaining system, and I have attempted to describe two areas where this can be accomplished during the organizing process and in teaching staff organizing. Labor education has its roots in such exercises, and the described program is a reaffirmation of those roots.

Norman Eiger, Associate Director
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University

Internal & External Organizing: An Action-Simulation Approach to Training

Alan Kistler dramatically reviewed the challenge of organizing the unorganized. One of many problems he mentioned is the role played by some university law and business schools in offering seminars on the "art of breaking unions." As union education activists, I think you should be aware that not only management but you too have a resource on the faculties of some state universities. Here I refer to some of the Labor-Education programs in universities. Remember that most university labor educators came from the labor movement and some have had considerable organizing experience.

In responding to the educational needs of the labor movement, I suggested to labor educators at the university level that they should not overlook the need for developing more knowledgeable and skillful organizers. Following my own counsel recently, I've tried to find the time to develop some new training approaches and materials in this area. As a result, two kinds of training programs were designed. One that deals with internal organizing and the other a long simulation for use in developing external organizers.

The internal organizing curriculum was put together in response to requests received from unions in the public sector. Those of you in the private sector with the security of the union shop can put your priorities elsewhere. However, it doesn't require much empathy to see the problem that exists in the public sector where the union shop is illegal and where, as in New Jersey, even the Agency shop is illegal. Many public sector locals find themselves required by law to represent everyone in a bargaining unit in which perhaps only a third of the workers are members of the union.

In response to an urgent request from one international union, I organized at the Rutgers Labor Education Center a two day workshop on internal organizing that proved highly successful. Although the program ended with the usual superlatives heard after people are actively involved in a program they find relevant, the worth of this program could only be judged later on by the effectiveness of the Union's campaign in signing up new members.

My first opportunity to evaluate this was coincidentally on the Metroliner coming down to this conference when I accidentally met some of the union's officers on the train. They were delighted to inform me that 800 new members were signed up since the workshop. "Was it the result of this program or would you have done it anyway," I inquired. They insisted on giving a lot of credit to the program. Singled out for special mention was the confidence and motivation engendered by the workshop role playing exercises, the skills in the art of persuasion and the systematic detailed structuring of a comprehensive organizing campaign.

Since the focus on this panel is on external organizing, and time is short, I'll turn to the game I designed called, "Organize!" Let me begin by saying it is still experimental because only parts of it have been tested in training organizers. It requires a minimum of three days and could take as long as four days for completion.

"Organize!" is designed as a simulation which takes the organizer-trainee through the stages of a typical organizing campaign. It confronts the organizer with many of the problems, challenges and strategies that an anti-union employer may have learned by attending one of the proliferating "unionbusting" seminars Brother Kistler described or hiring a management consultant who specializes in zapping organizing campaigns.

"Organize!" is designed to challenge organizers to anticipate the changing strategy of the employer and to come up with counter strategies. If successful, it encourages the organizer to make decisions on alternatives, and take risks in devising and experimenting with new ideas and tactics that he/she ordinarily wouldn't be willing to take because the stakes are too high in real-life organizing. It also stresses a team problem solving approach by bringing experienced and inexperienced organizers together in a cooperative effort. Finally, it seeks to improve the organizer's communication skills in house visits and the design of leaflets and letters.

The first phase of "Organize!" covers the plant survey; the second phase has its objective signing up a majority of the workers and countering management's campaign; the final phase focuses on winning the election.

There are various ways the simulation can be played. You can divide the participants into an organizers team, a management team and an employee team (in a university setting, office personnel and students can be involved in the employee roles). A consultant in communications skills and media is made available to assist in improving verbal and written communications.

The instructor-coordinator's role is an active one for he creates a community environment that changes as the campaign proceeds. For example, the instructor may introduce a copy of the town newspaper which announces that a shop has closed throwing 100 people in the community out of work. Or the newspaper may report a major strike in a neighboring town.

If the length of time involved (3 days) is too long for a particular union, you can separate each phase and work on improving the skills needed for that particular phase. For example, if you want to teach making a plant survey, just use that section of the materials that require the organizers to research the community background and role play face to face meetings with the employees to obtain the layout of the shop and the names of contacts. This should take about two hours. Most of the role plays are video taped. These are examined by the group and the interactions analyzed for mistakes, weaknesses and strengths.

It is suggested that each team be given a consultant who helps it develop a systematic analysis of the problems and factors involved in the campaign following the survey phase. A useful tool for structuring this analysis and encouraging participation by all the participants is the Force Field Analysis technique which requires the group to identify all the forces operating in a problem situation, assess the role they play and come up with ways to change the balance in favor of moving towards the organizer's goal.

A one day program can be developed that deals just with the pre-election phase. Here the organizers are pitted against a management strategy based on a composite of what is being used to successfully defeat unionization. The simulation materials provide the management team with a six-page counter-plan to the union drive that requires every bit of imagination and skill to overcome. Management's plan includes, in addition to "one-on-one" supervisor-worker meetings, some fifteen written communications as well as the organization of an employee vote "no" committee. The management team can select any or all of the suggested tactics. One communication that can be used, for example, is the familiar "pay envelope trick." A slip is placed in the employee's pay envelope during the pre-election campaign which says: "In this envelope you will find a check for $8.00 which is the amount deducted from your paycheck to prove a point about the union dues you would have taken out for the rest of your working life. Add it up, at the end of the year it amounts to $96.00; after five years the union will have taken $480.00 from you; multiply this by 240 employees and it comes to $129,600 that comes out of the worker' pockets at Superior Plastics. So you can see why these outsiders are spending so much time trying to get in -- Don't waste your money!"

This is a sample of the kind of employer communication the union team has to neutralize.

In discussing this approach to training organizers with one organizing director I was informed that he didn't believe in the usefulness of simulations. I don't know if he is right -- but these materials should get a chance to be adequately tested.

It is a truism among most educators that for education to be effective it should not be based on a passive absorbing of information or listening to the battle stories of veteran leaders. An important part of the training of organizers should be the practice of skills in an active, changing, risk free environment that stimulates logical analysis of the problems and the development of creative ideas.

The materials and design of the simulation are based on my experience as an organizer and labor educator. It distills a number of mistakes I made as an organizer and the kind of training I would have liked to have received but didn't get when I first started.

Since time is limited, contact me if you want to explore this approach to training organizers further.

Response to Union Busting "Education Conferences"

Robert L. Muehlenkamp,
Organizing Director,
National Union of Hospital and
Health Care Employees, Local 1199

I want to start out with an example of an incident that occurred in my presence during an organizing drive in up-state New York. It was a relatively small town and by most standards a union town, dominated by one large plant with 4200 industrial workers. We were organizing a hospital in that town with 500 workers eligible to vote in an election. There was no central labor council in that area and we had gotten together with several trade unions in the area to have our committee talk with them, talk about the problems the workers were having in the hospital and the problems they were having in the organizing drive. At that breakfast meeting the leaders of all the trade unions in the area were present. After the workers made their presentation the newly elected President of the largest there, the 4200 member local, made some comments. He had just been elected by the way because the former President was considered a "company man" and one of the reasons he was considered a "company man" was that a lot of the guys in the plant whose wives were in the hospital didn't think the local union has been active enough in support of the hospital workers in organizing. That was one of the issues in the internal election.

After we had made our presentation he stood up and said he just didn't think that it was possible for this particular hospital to have that attitude toward their workers. This man had been a machine operator for 31 years in that plant. He knew the man who ran that hospital and he knew the Trustees. Indeed, he did: 7 out of 17 were from his company. And as far as he was concerned those trustees and hospital management would be happy to have a strong union that would systematize the seniority program, handle routine and petty grievances and get them out of the way, make sure what the workers' benefits were and take that off management's back and so forth. We just didn't agree with it and he in fact blocked a very strong trade union effort behind those workers in organizing.

I raise that as an example before I begin talking about some details about what is happening at least in our industry with these consultants because I think it illustrates a couple of things that provide a context that we ought to keep in mind as we discuss this question. Obviously that man did not understand what was happening to those hospital workers in terms of the specific tactic that the employer was involved in. They had hired the most notorious consulting firm in our industry. Nor did he understand that that was only a symptom of a much more serious problem. He wasn't going to help those workers win that election on the spot and in a tactical sense he didn't understand the difficulties they faced, but more important he didn't understand what was happening in his town, where he had been a machine operator for 31 years. I said this to him.

Seven out of the seventeen Trustees that made those decisions about that hospital were his bosses. And they saw what was happening in the hospital very much in the same terms that Alan talked about this morning and which Secretary-Treasurer Kirkland referred to as class-warfare going on somewhere in this country. This guy didn't see that. He did not see that it was very much in the interest of himself and his members in that plant to see that those 500 workers had an AFL-CIO union. And he did absolutely nothing to see that those workers had a union. And he did not understand that the employer very much saw it in class terms and mobilized the entire employer class against those 500 workers, whereas, we were not able to do that on our side.

And so I would say that as we discuss this question I think we have to keep in mind that there are much broader concerns than just the tactical ones in trying to fight off these characters. I didn't know about the IUD resolution about using more resources to publicly try to change labor's image which is pretty rotten in a lot of situations where we are working. I think that part of the education program in organizing and winning elections should go beyond this consultants thing. I think it should concern us, first, within the unions to educate ourselves so that an incident like this does not take place. And, second, that we really must allocate more of our resources, and get more resources on our side, to change that image and stop complaining about how the schools distort it and don't teach it at all, how the media distorts it and don't teach it all and to stop asking them to do it and start doing it more ourselves on a much bigger basis because that is as much a part of this struggle to win an election in that town or in the south as it is to try to learn how to fight these guys and thugs on the spot.

With that context in mind I would like to describe what I call the "Maximum Campaign" that these vermin try to run and some of the things we have learned about how to deal with them. I am describing a maximum campaign. They are not able to put this anti-union campaign together all the time, all these elements in a single campaign. But this is what the best of these thugs shoot for.

I will outline five general approaches they take. First, since the NLRB is not balanced at all any more and is now so much on managements side, they can choose their own timing and they completely run the campaign from start to finish; I am talking about the lawyers, working with the labor consultants, they pick their own timing--the length of the campaign. Because they are able to do that they are able to formulate and plan a campaign from beginning to end because they completely control the timing element.

Second, at least the most serious consultants in our industry ask for and really try to get complete control over the institution for the duration of the campaign. That is, whatever production that particular company has, takes second place during the campaign even if they lose money, even if they lose production. Some of them demand and give a money-back guarantee if they lose the election, they pay back the costs that you pay them. But in return you have to give them control of the company for the duration of the campaign. They get that and run a completely coordinated campaign; that is, everything from literature and speeches and legal stuff to broader community participation. They are totally cynical about everything this country stands for and for them a trade union election is nothing but a psychological con-game and you have to know that.

So, they stretch out the campaign. During that time they call in these characters and they do research and they have funds set up to do research. The Melnick firm (also known as "3-M" and Modern Management Methods), is really cute: they have various fronts that they use. These guys come in and it's a front for them and they do a survey questionnaire. They very systematically sit down with each worker and they fill out these forms and try to find out what it is the workers have on their minds. They also obviously have a complete file on all of us. If you run into a campaign where the boss doesn't put out all your dirty linen, I don't know why not because they just have it readily available. These guys, however, tailor all that stock research and stock literature to each campaign. It is very specifically oriented to this boss and this group of employees.

They run as I said, a completely coordinated campaign. They work with everyone who is not eligible to vote, including bosses on all levels plus non-bargaining unit employees. In our industry if you have a service and maintenance election at a 400-bed hospital you will have 550 or so eligible workers and you will have another 700 employees in the institution. They mobilize all bosses whether they supervise workers eligible or not, all employees who are not eligible to vote, and pressure them into certain kinds of activity.

41

They mobilize all media, radio, television and newspapers to the extent where we have not even been able to purchase ads in newspapers in many towns. Remember who the Trustees of the hospitals are. I don't suspect it's a great deal different no matter what industry you are in. Normally the publisher of the local newspaper, the president of the bank, etc. are all on the hospital's Board of Trustees. They round up the business community and have them put out the propaganda. They have even aggressively approached other trade unionists, organized trade union leaders, to try to isolate the union who is trying to organize the workers, so they don't miss anything that they can line up on their side--very systematic and very careful.

The thing they do best is use the front-line supervisors as their organizing committee. And while maybe in the south the lawyers handle this, in the north they have a certain squeamishness, the lawyers don't like to do the muscle stuff. So, what they do is they get the consultants to do the muscle stuff and that means usually the front-line supervisors going after the workers. This is what they really specialize at.

First of all, they clean out the supervisory apparatus. They interview each supervisor who is a front-line person. If that supervisor is a problem because the workers don't like him and if they feel that the union's going to get that department's votes, they will get that supervisor out. Or if that supervisor for one reason or another is too close to the workers or just is not inclined to go along with the strong arm union busting campaign, they will get rid of him. If they can fire him, they fire him. Remember they were given the authority to take over that apparatus in the beginning. And they use it.

They get rid of the bosses and they bring in people who will run the campaign against the workers in a way they want it run. If it is a situation where they can't fire them they isolate them, they promote them, they reassign them or transfer them, so they are not involved in the campaign; they replace them with someone who they can manipulate.

They use that front-line committee, that front-line supervisory committee, in a most intensive way. They never hand out literature. They never just distribute literature in the hospital or stack them around or whatever. Every day the supervisor has a list of workers who are eligible in the campaign. Every day in the morning the first thing they do is they come in, they go into the office of these thugs, (they have been given offices in the institutions) and they report and that guy tells them what they are to do that day, person by person.

If there are leaflets to be distributed they don't hand them out, they sit down with each worker and talk to them about it and at the end of the day they report back to the labor consultant person by person exactly what happened. It doesn't matter that they didn't do any work or that the workers didn't do any work that day--that was the only work that was supposed to be done! Very, very intensive! Very precise--they will have guys stay at the hospitals. They give them beds. They live in the hospital around the clock, three shifts. Two or three consultants live there 24 hours a day for weeks and months on end.

And they systematically attempt to destroy your leadership. They find out, obviously, who your leaders are and they transfer or promote and try to define-out through labor board proceedings, and they fire. Generally in our industry, in voluntary hospitals, they don't fire that much. In South Carolina where we are now organizing a hospital they sent a stooge to our committee meeting and got all the names and they fired more than half of the committee, in Columbia. So, it is still different from area to area but generally they attempt to eliminate the union leadership.

At the Maine Medical Center in Portland we had about a 5-month delay at the Board and without firing a single committee person by the time the election came we had available in the bargaining unit only one-third of the original organizing committee and they hadn't fired anyone. They had eliminated them from the campaign in other ways through promotions, transfers, whatever.

Finally, the consultants that they depend on, as I say, are totally cynical, they don't believe in anything that we in this room believe in. They see the whole election process--the Labor Board's laboratory conditions--as a laboratory for them in a different way. It is for them a complete con-game. They are industrial psychologists but not in the old sense. They really study the stuff and we see very common things happening all the way from New Mexico to Appalachia to heavily organized parts of New England. Just to give you a couple of examples, they try to create a situation the last couple of days before the election where (and remember, these are hospitals I am talking about), you would think that the union was trying to burn down the hospital and kill all the patients in the hospital. They very successfully create that type of atmosphere. They do it by calling in fire alarms so firemen and cops are running all over the place the last couple of days. They do it by slashing tires in parking lots and breaking windshields. Things that never happened in small towns ever before in the history of that hospital. Cops are all over investigating and it is two days before the election and this kind of thing keeps happening. I am telling you some of the things that happen as a pattern from

Sante Fe to Fairmont, West Virginia, to Corning, New York, to Boston. These exact same things happen in the days prior to the election.

We just had an election in Indiana against Seyfarth and Shaw. Many of you must know of them. They represent the Agricultural Growers in California against Chavez. They represent Tennaco in Newport News. They represent the Washington Post and the New York Times. They are getting big in hospitals now. We just whipped them in Indiana where in the days before the election there was literally not a square foot of space on the walls anywhere in that hospital which was not covered with propaganda. Workers first pulled the stuff down and then if they couldn't pull it down they wrote all over it and desecrated the stuff and finally they had put up private security guards to guard the posters. For the last two days they hired city police in city uniforms on off time to stand by the posters and guard them with guns to create this atmosphere of terror and you see the same thing every place. Sometimes they raffle a color television set. If you vote you get your ticket. It is a completely cynical approach toward the entire idea of a secret ballot election.

I would say that those are the main elements of what I would call a maximum campaign. Sometimes they are not able to do it, sometimes the employer is a little squeamish. Sometimes something else happens but that is what they shoot for.

Now, what's our experience and how can we deal with this campaign? I can tell you we have not dealt successfully--wherever they have been able to get a maximum campaign underway. I think that not just our union but SEIU and other unions active in health care have not won a campaign in a voluntary hospital where they have put the maximum campaign together--not one. I am talking about the workers' first attempts at an election only. I am going to get to the second time in a moment.

On the other hand, I think I should caution you about an attitude that I think we have to be careful that we don't get into and that is this: I think it is fine for us to act among ourselves and in the press and in organizing meetings with a sense of outrage about this conduct. I think among ourselves we ought to know better though. Keep in mind the class warfare going on. The other side's job is to beat and stop you and to throw you out etc. and they are doing their job better than we are. Stop complaining, stop acting with moral outrage except to the press and workers who have not been through it before, and prepare yourself because you are not going to get anywhere with outrage anymore.

With those two things in mind I would like to give you some examples of some things that we think have been successful and helpful. I am trying to keep in mind that I am not talking to organizers directly but to those of you who are responsible for education in the various international and universities. I think we have to draw the distinction between winning elections and organizing workers into unions. The point is, if you think the union campaign is to win an election, you are probably going to make a lot of mistakes from the beginning.

In general we have to prevent the employers from putting together maximum campaigns--the one I just described--and try to knock out some elements and to try to put them a little bit on the defensive. You can't do that if you think the only purpose is to get 30 percent of the cards, throw them in at the NLRB and go for an election. You are going to get killed. That is the end of it. Who knows when you will be back.

So, I would say we have to prevent them from putting this maximum campaign together. I heard some people whom I was talking with earlier say we have to come up with some new ideas in organizing. We don't have any new ideas. In fact we are telling our staff to get better at the fundamentals. If you think in terms of organizing workers into a union instead of winning an election then you think more seriously about putting your leadership together and giving the committee full responsibility to build and run the campaign. Take more seriously your time commitment to it and how long it may take and how much support you need in terms of signing up people. Make sure that you have a clear idea of what you want to try to get workers to do, how many workers you insist attend meetings but before you even file for an election and so forth. Those are the fundamentals and there are not very many tricks about them. You just have to pursue them more rigorously. We have to keep in mind the timing of the campaign as we go through it and plan not to do everything at the beginning in order to get workers to sign union cards for the union while the boss sits back and waits as I said for the con-game in the end and then you don't have anything left to hit him with. In general, I think, you know the employers' propaganda strategy is to get workers to vote against the union. They say: "Look no one in this country in electoral politics votes for anyone or anything. They vote against something." They say the same in union elections. Don't ask workers to vote for you. No worker is stupid enough to vote for their boss; get them to vote against something.

We have to understand the same kind of thing and not allow ourselves as a general principle to be put on the defensive. I think we have to make an issue in the campaign of these labor consultants themselves. We have in our industry, working mostly with SEIU put together a book on every major law firm and consulting firm that's now operating. By a book, I mean a collection of a general summary of who they are and how they operate and four or five of their most vicious pieces of literature and sometimes we tell workers you can't sign up a union card until you have read this and sign something saying you have read it. This is to try to prepare people for what the campaign looks like. We try to do a lot of preparation. I think and I know the Organizing Department of the AFL-CIO is talking about putting together slide shows on these things and maybe even some films. We think that would be very helpful to try to prepare people. Very important also is for us to see the campaign as a completely coordinated campaign. We must line up whatever working class, or progressive forces there are in a city to try to get them to help the workers to organize just as the other side does. We have to inform them of the problems and why workers are organizing and have them meet the workers and to line up everything in that town on our side which we possibly can; overlooking no one because the other side will get to them if we don't.

Finally, in general, I think we have to try to get our people to go on the initiative in these campaigns. As I said we must prevent them from establishing the maximum campaign. What do I mean by that? We can do it in a lot of ways. In some situations there may be a department where you're very strong. They just tell that boss (talking about hospitals again, some companies don't care about such things) in this case maybe it's the head nurse, they tell the head nurse: "You try to hold anti-union meetings with us on company time--company meetings--and there will be a sitdown the first time you try." That's where you represent 100 percent of the workers in the department and put the pressure on that head nurse because she should have other things like patient care on her mind. Back them off and take the initiative, don't wait for her to start calling the first meeting. Obviously try to get people to bust up captive audience meetings.

If you are worried about what the labor law says--whether it's an unfair labor practice or not--I think you will be doing to the committee you are training a disservice. Now, I say that again in voluntary hospitals primarily in the mid-west and in the east where firing is something they don't like to do. It is where I think we need to be very, very aggressive. In Columbia we couldn't be quite that aggressive. But we certainly can't go on what the NLRB says are the perimeters of our ability to maneuver.

Within the last two months we have been able in our industry to do something we could not have done two years ago and that is we have gotten the 3-M Company fired at three hospitals. We got them fired because we finally got onto them. Within the unions active in health care we have exchanged some information, including profiles on the individual thugs because of this and because of political sensitivities involved in these campaigns in Boston; we finally got a Catholic church to fire them in St. Elizabeth; in Corning, New York we got rid of them early on in the campaign through a lot of pressure from the other unions and through the media; we were successful because we had the goods on them ahead of time and were able to put out all the information everywhere about how much they cost. Also, they were fired in Madison, Wisconsin. And last year, we got them fired in a second election in a hospital where we won.

I am not saying that in all industries you can go and do that. Our industry is sensitive in different ways than other industries.

Finally, this strategy comes back to the distinction that I was making earlier between organizing workers into a union and trying to win elections. We have not yet won in hospitals in a single first election where they have put it all together. However, we think if we do the right kind of work with the workers, such as providing leadership so that rank and file workers become active leaders inside those institutions then it doesn't matter so much whether we win or lose the first time. That is not to take the cynical approach of "Well we will file a petition and the workers will learn the hard way; and maybe they will come back later on because they won't listen to me no matter what I tell them. They have to learn it." I don't mean that. I mean a serious, dedicated, long-term effort to prepare workers. Maybe they don't make it the first time. But we have been winning second elections against these guys. Why? We drive up the price--the price institutionally. In hospitals if the boss is the head nurse, they don't like having to be a thug a second time around for another six months to the workers they have to live with. We can drive up the price and we can drive a wedge into the other side and make it more costly for them to do it the second time. We have won second elections against these characters. Does that take years? Yes. Is it expensive? Yes. But if we are going to organize, and we have to, there is no other way to do it.

Thank you.

Al Bilik
International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers

I am going to try to be very brief. The International Union of Electrical Workers, plagued as all labor organizations are today, particularly in the private sector, and I would like to comment a little about the public sector because I think its experience in recent years is instructive for us.

We really would like to look inside and try to determine whether there are things we are not doing that could enhance our ability to organize. You knew the facts, I am not going to provide that -- it's horrendous. We are declining rapidly and threatening to disappear literally as a major institution in the American society. I mean the free trade union movement.

So we have training and Gloria Johnson, who is our Education Director, does an excellent job at that. We have staff training. We are not only training, but we have made a conscience effort to develop a staff that is representative of the working groups that we are trying to organize. We have had a typical white male in his 40's and 50's kind of organizing staff and that's understandable. However, it is unacceptable. But that is the way the movement has grown up. So we have made a conscience effort to bring women on to our staff, younger people, Blacks. And that is important and we are moving in that direction and doing reasonably well. But I must add, despite our efforts, the reality of organizing today in the private sector is such that nothing resembles my Kentucky experience of the past. There was no such thing as official collective bargaining 30 years ago. Moreover, the phrase was an alien phrase in the public sector in 1950 in the United States. There was no such thing as dues deduction. There was no such thing as recognition and certainly none that was called exclusive. Strikes were unheard of. Arbitration was not permissable because that violated the notions of sovereignty and those were sacred. I did some organizing then in Kentucky and came under the guiding eye of Jimmy Wolfe in those days. Just a few years after that I did some organizing in Kentucky in the private sector in the Old United Auto Workers, AFL, now known as the Allied Industrial Workers.

I found there as early as 1953 that it was possible to organize in the private sector in a state like Kentucky, in Paris, Kentucky no less. I'm thinking of a run away plant called "Detroit Harvestor."

We had an election and we won it and that local I guess still exists in Detroit. Perhaps in Paris not in Detroit. In any event, in that period public employees were difficult to organize for obvious reasons. They had no protection at all under the law. And they were completely under the mercy, as it was, of foremen and political bosses and so on.

In the private sector during the 50's, even in Kentucky it was possible to organize and organization did take place. In the 70's you have a reverse of this situation where today the private sector is declining rapidly and extreme difficulty exists in organizing. Now we see the ultimate sophistication of the professional consultants who infest the field.

On the public side, on the other hand, protected by law as they are, there is one other valuable ingredient which I consider now to be the crucial ingredient. In the public sector, generally, a neutral employer with regard to the basic question of unionizing versus no union, what Muehlenkamp has described and what Harold described in the south is normally not present in the public sector elections today. That is, in the public sector there is almost a total absence of an involved employer in the campaign whether it's federal, state or local. Where there is collective bargaining allowed, the employer traditionally is neutral and that is the crucial difference in my opinion between the relative success in the two areas.

General Electric, the major firm with whom the IUE deals, has been in a collective bargaining relationship for over 40 years. You would expect that GE would not, as noble as that company is, bother with outsiders such as the paid consultants that you have heard about. General Electric breeds its own. GE has an intense in-house non-union department. It is called "Non-union Department" and it functions. I have only the greatest respect for the talents that they are able to recruit and develop in that department. I hate them, but I have respect for them. What GE does is very interesting, having given us a recognition of the unions right to exist wherever we are in fact established. And GE does recognize our right to survive. It bargains in reasonably good faith, whatever that means this week. It does not, where we are organized, attempt to undermine the union by way of the de-authorization election which we have heerd about or the outright decertification, and I am sure Alan Kistler talked about that this morning.

General Electric accepts the union where we win an election. However, in the case of GE and their Non-union Department, they have a very thorough program which is designed to keep their non-union plants (excuse the expression) "union-free." And they are now using that phrase. They have their own plan, and we are very familiar with it. This is what I mean: I happened to come across the plan one day. Everyone of our 140 odd field staff have a copy of it. And, we use it for training.

Gloria Johnson will remember last year, a series of training sessions with our staff in which we used the plan. You have to say one thing about General Electric, it does things very thoroughly but without imagination. They don't change their methods. They adhere strickly to this plan. Someone might add the comment, since they are so damn successful, why change? We don't win any elections these days against GE, I want you to know that.

The Plan: they list their major themes for all their people in the Non-union Department beginning with a summary of IUE's organizing record. Because of the company's tactics, our record is not good with GE. It is relatively good otherwise. A major item they list is strikes. Another major item they list, among others, is the phrase "job destruction" which they attribute to us, of course, as a union. Having set out these major themes -- there are 8 in number -- they then show a full year's program and this is done without an organizing campaign going on in the particular plant. This is their standard week-after-week kind of activity and they use their house organ in each of their locations to propagandize their views.

One example is Portsmouth, Virginia, a TV plant where they make color televisions. We do still make some in the United States. Some 2,500 employees are involved. Now, they will use the company publication according to the appropriate pattern, and it runs, in this case, from October to the following September. And the references are interesting. Every month there are two things that they emphasize -- the strike -- and job loss. What they do is they will recall for the non-union workers a feature about a strike involving IUE. Of course, an IUE-GE case gets first billing but a strike of any kind is alright. If you can't find one that week for GE, they will pick one up that has to do with another location where we have had a strike.

I want to give them credit for that. Then they go on with the other item and that is the loss of jobs. And here is the item that becomes the major one for us. What they do is describe any location where there is a cutback in the number of workers as attributable to the union's presence. They make a logical sequence out of it -- a cutback and a closedown. It becomes a phrase, a series of words that are suppose to just become a kind of catechism for the workers. Secondly, in June, July and August they do not refer to unions at all in this publication. They are carefully warned not to do that because they don't want to interfere with vacation seasons. They talk about ball games, family day, a month of appreciation day, people on the way up, service recognition and so on. This is all very nice. It's good company stuff but no union stuff through June, July and August. They resume that in September. The headline will say, "IUE Leads Union Work Stoppages." You know then that we are back in business again. That is the way they function.

Now, when there is an actual campaign underway, they have their "mini-series" of instructions for their in-plant people. It is a four-week program. It is like a two-minute drill in pro-football. This occurs the last four weeks before election day and it is very carefully prescribed. There is not latitude here for an enterprising industrial man in Portsmouth, Virginia. He is given a pattern and you better follow it. It is really very carefully worked out. They have a script about what one should say to get the message through to the workers. I want to read to you quickly from a piece I have just recently put together which indicates finally what the problem is for us.

It is not in fact that GE plans its own effort. They ought to. If they want to stay non-union they ought to work at it and they do. I understand this, we ought to be able to combat that generally. We ought to be able to handle the question of GE saying to its workers, "Why pay dues?" We already, unilaterally, give you the benefits of the IUE contract. We have a national agreement. You know, the non-union location votes "yes" for the union even where they automatically come under that national contract. So, GE cleverly gives its non-union people the actual benefits of the contract and not only gives it to them but tells them in writing that this is the IUE-GE contract.

On June 21 of the following year there is an automatic wage adjustment in the contract, and you will now get this as well. Why spend and waste all that money on union dues? Well, we should be able to cope with that. The problem for us is in the continuous effort of the company and this is not only GE, but so many companies today which directly, openly and illegally, say to the workers,"A union is bad for business. It may or it will cause strikes. Strikes will lose us business and customers will look elsewhere."

So General Electric said to its employees, "We have a conscious program of providing two sources of supply for every one of our major pieces of production. If there is one union, we are going to have one that's "non-union." They said this recently in a campaign in Goldsboro, North Carolina, which Harold is familiar with because nobody knows more about what goes on in the south than he does. But this is the kind of situation in which the company produces a product that is equally produced in a northern organized plant. It tells its employees that their policy is to have one non-union source of supply and it doesn't take much to get that one through their head. Obviously, they indicate that we are going to have to move the operation to a non-union location. The company did that in its last election with us in Goldsboro where we had signed up a majority of the workers.

In our union we will not petition for an election under NLRB without a substantial majority of the workers' signatures on cards because we know what happens during the campaign. There is an inevitable fall-off approximating 30 percent from card signers to "yes" votes in the election which may only be five or six weeks later.

It doesn't take much for the employer who says to his workers, "Look, vote as if your job depends on it." And don't think they don't say that openly. And that is illegal! Vote as if your job depends on it and more often than not,workers will do exactly that because between the union and the job there is no contest. It is really that simple. In this case, GE had violated the law by saying to the workers, "We really won't stay here if you vote union because we have to have a non-union source of supply to take care of our customers." The workers voted against representation -- not against the IUE, not for the company, they just voted "no" for collective bargaining which is the central question, of course. And we filed objections.

The Board sustained our objections and about 8 or 9 months later ordered a new election. What did the company do at that point? They sent a letter to their employees saying:

"Dear employee: Even though the majority of you voted against the union, etc." and you went to the NLRB and somehow connived them to go to unusual extremes, you're not going to prevail. What really happened was, the attorney for the company persuaded an NLRB hearing officer that the plant managers' remarks, to wit, a union victory would result in inevitable strikes coupled with incidence of violence, loss of jobs etc., was merely a direct quote from the rule of the NLRB in the first election.

Of course, we lost the second time. Muehlenkamp may have had good results in the hospitals with a second election because there is some sense of humanity among supervisors (I have noticed that in my own experience with hospital supervisors.) With General Electric there is no humanity, it's all on computers and they work absolutely on that basis.

So, I will wind up the session. My conclusion is really very simple. I at one time thought that we were successful in the public sector because of such great organizers and that in the private sector guys just didn't know how to do it, Harold. So until I came to IUE 2½ years ago, having left AFSCME, I have come to the conclusion that there are excellent organizers in the private sector at least as good as the public sector.

The difference is really very simple and we better not lose sight of it -- if in fact a strong viable independent trade union movement is necessary to the proper functioning of a democratic society. We had better examine the critical attitudes about this labor movement. Sitting back and saying you guys appear to be the victims, but, indeed, you may very well be the villains as well. You might not be doing the things that give you the better image.

Let me tell you about this image foolishness. We get caught up in this and somehow assume that George Meany's face is on the ballot when workers vote Yes or No for collective bargaining. That's a lot of hogwash. The fact is workers vote for or against collective bargaining. Many of us are concerned about the mission of the movement, its inadequacy and God knows it is loaded with inadequacies. We sometimes assume that because we don't really appreciate the ineffectiveness of the movement generally that for the average worker when he gets to choose between collective bargaining and individual begging somehow becomes intellectualized or radicalized at that moment of truth and says "Screw George Meany." Foolishness. Absolutely.

The reason we don't organize basically is because the employer can get away with murder until we do something about that. Until we are able to put teeth into the law or to dispose of the law and go the way of the 30's we are not going to effectively organize in the private sector.

As long as the public sector employers pursue a stance of neutraility allowing workers a free shot at it without fear or intimidation, organizing levels will remain high. They will continue to vote union as long as the employer does not threaten them with job loss. Fortunately, who ever heard of a runaway government. Fortunately, indeed.

Harold McIver,
Organizational Director,
Industrial Union Department,
AFL-CIO

Let me pass on a few things to you before I get into talking about some of the problems we encounter and how we learned to combat some of the tactics that are thrown to us. I don't know how many of you have seen the film, "Norma Rae" -- it just came out in the Carolinas -- but that film is about a lady that was fired in a J. P. Stevens plant in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina. Now, I saw the film last Friday and I would say it's a good piece of material, looking at it from the union's point of view, because it does show some of the conditions that the people are working under in the textile industry and it shows success. It shows the union winning.

In real life, the first election at Roanoke Rapids was in 1965 and the election was thrown out. The election, held in 1974, was actually a rerun of the 1965 election. That election was blocked for nine years and actually it was still blocked. We simply filed a request to proceed and went ahead with the election, saying that we would have the election even though there were still outstanding unfair labor practices.

Right off the bat, a lady (Norma Rae in the film) attended a meeting and was sold and decided that she was going to try to help organize those seven plants and 3,500 people in Roanoke Rapids. It wasn't too long after that that she was discharged for trying to copy a notice down off the bulletin board. Before she left the mill, she got up on a table, made a little speech and held up a sign that said "union". At this point, some of the machines were shut down.

Actually, the way she was discharged is identical to the way it was presented in the movie. They tried to get her to leave the plant. She wouldn't leave and they called the police. The police came in and drug her out of the mill and took her to jail. The organizer on the scene called me. The first thing we did was tell them we were going to sue them for false arrest and that they were aiding and abetting J. P. Stevens in trying to keep the union out. Finally, the charges were dropped. Then we put her on the payroll to the extent of giving her some expense money. She worked full time trying to help organize those seven plants, along with one other organizer. At a later date, we finally did put her on the payroll.

The first account of this story was in an article for the New York Times. After that, there was a group out of New York that came down and did about a 45-minute film that was shown on the TV. Later this same man, Hank Leiferman, came back and wrote a book called Crystal Lee. Her name was Crystal Lee Jordan at that time and it is now Crystal Lee Jordan Sutton. She's divorced and remarried and living in Burlington, North Carolina. We were successful in collecting backpay for her to the tune of $22,000. She went back to J. P. Stevens and worked two days and left.

What I'm really saying to you is, I think if you haven't seen the film, do go see it. You'll enjoy it. It looks like we may be getting a little break there for a change.

I think it was mentioned to you earlier that our image is not very high at this point in this country and I am in favor of anything we can do to help change that image. The IUD Executive Council passed a resolution earlier this year to encourage the AFL-CIO to do whatever they can to enact a program to try to help change our image. I am sure that a lot of you have probably seen the ILG jingle on TV at one time or another. I was surprised to learn that the jingle has actually only been on nationwide TV about 30 times. It's quite expensive.

One of the things that we're trying to do is look for ways and means to try to combat some of the opposition down South where I have spent all of my time as a union organizer. One of the things we have done and are going to do more of in the future is try to utilize radio. Now in Roanoke Rapids, we had the election campaign there and there were only three radio stations in town. We saturated all three of those stations beginning five days prior to the election. We had something like four spots on at the shift changes at 8:00, 4:00 and 12:00. Then the day of the election, August 28, we put together a 30-minute program that went on three times that day. And in that 30-minute program, we had tapes of people like Andy Young who came down to rally on the Sunday prior to the election. We had tapes of a minister that attended some of our meetings in Raleigh, North Carolina and also had parts of speeches that I had made inside the plant to rebut some captive audience speeches. So, while the workers drove to work the day of the election, we were able to get to some of them.

Normally I feel that that's the way they beat us a lot of times; because they have access to the workers and we have a hard time getting our message across. Don't let anybody ever tell you that access is not important. When I got inside those J. P. Stevens plants and the workers saw that they had to furnish me with a podium just like this and if the boss had a glass of water, they had to give me a glass of water, and everything was supposed to be equal, it made a difference. J. P. Stevens over the years tried to create the image that nobody was going to make them do anything that they didn't want to do -- the courts or anybody else. In my speeches I would start off by saying that the company boasted that nobody would make them do anything that they didn't consider to be fair and reasonable and that they didn't want to do. I would start off by saying, "I'm sure that all of you would agree that they don't want me here today." So, it makes a difference -- the fact that you are there.

I talked to a lot of people down in Bal Harbour. One problem was trying to change the tax laws to the extent that we could keep J. P. Stevens, Florida Steel, and others from deducting their unfair labor practices as a business expense. Something like $1,400,000 was collected out of J. P. Stevens, but I'd be willing to bet that if we had some way to prove that they didn't pay that, they deducted it from their taxes and really, there's no incentive to keep these companies from violating the law. I think maybe we should be able to get a bill like that passed.

I am trying to cooperate with Alan Kistler and their department in any way I can as far as compiling information about these consultants that we've been up against. There are five of them that operate heavily in North Carolina, but the consultants are really amateurs compared to the law firms. When you get up against a law firm, against a real pro, they use any means to try to beat you any way they can including firing people and black-balling them once they get them fired.

Another problem in the Carolinas is down in Greenville. There's a firm called Thompson, Haynesworth, Ogletree and Deakins. They have all parted and gone different directions. Haynesworth went out and employed a group of young lawyers and they've got the reputation of, probably right now, of of the best union busters in the south. There again, they'll use most any means they can to try to defeat you.

One thing I tried to do over the years is to learn as much as possible about the companies that we're trying to organize. Some of the things that we try to get in advance is as much information as we can on the finances and I am sure all of you are aware of the 10-K reports and things of that nature. I think you can find out more about an employer if you get securities and exchange 10-K reports than any other piece of information that's available.

During the course of the campaign, we try to tape their meetings, and that is legal. If the worker is in a meeting, then they are a party to that speech. I am sure that a lot of you have maybe talked to some worker and asked "What did the boss say during the course of this speech?" You get three or four different versions. But, if you have the speech taped, then certainly you know exactly what was said and you know if a violation has been committed. If you get into another campaign when they are using that particular lawyer or that particular consultant, you can get your committee together, sit them down and play the tape for them -- now here is what the boss has been saying. Practically any law firm that you can mention in the South, we have been up against them one time or another and I guess about the best way to try to defeat these people is prepare the people in advance as to what they are going to say and when they're going to say it. We keep letters, as I said, we keep the captive audience speeches, and we transcribe them into written words. We give them to all the organizers, so if you run across a guy in one campaign and you have a campaign going somewhere else, you will know more about how to deal with him because you've got the material that he used before. Now, a lot of them don't use the same thing every time, just like we don't use the same thing every time. They used to show a lot of films down there. One of them was"Women Must Weep" and the IAM put an answer to that one in "Anatomy of a Lie." We still use that film. We will show the initial film, if we think that there is going to be a slide presentation or that they might show them the "Springfield Gun" which is better from their point of view than "Women Must Weep."

We show them "Anatomy of a Lie" and "Women Must Weep" for a purpose; that is, to try to establish credibility as far as the exaggeration. Now, you might say, why would you do that if the company is not going to show it, but it shows the contrast and the extent that some companies will go to try to fool the people and really get their minds off their wages and their working conditions.

Now lately, they have dropped the films and the real pros are using slide presentations. We were able to obtain a copy of it after suing some people in Sanford, North Carolina. There was an article that appeared in the paper the day before the election, and it was all about companies closing down and how bad unions were. The Chamber of Commerce helped put in some money for that thing. We then got the election set aside because they were interferring with the union's right to go in and organize. They were conspiring with the employer to violate the workers' right and the union's civil rights.

Just a glance through the slide presentation: the law says the company does not have to agree to any union proposal which it think is not in the best interest of the company and all their employees. And then they cite cases and there is a prepared text that goes along with it. Then they get into the plants that are closed down. They show them all these plants that are closed and they insinuate that the union may have had something to do with the plant's closing. Usually they name all the plants that had unions and they add the bit that the unions didn't do anything at all for those workers after they closed and left town. The workers were left unemployed.

"Decertification Election, Union Loses Certification in Chatham, N.C."
"Clothing Workers call off Strikes At Whiteville Plant."
"Man Shot at Plant as Dispute Boils"

"Woman Charges Somebody Tore Lady's Clothes Off and She Is Trying to Scare Them."
"Brunswick Plant is Bullet Target -- Governor's Intervention Fails to Halt Bitter Strike At Mills."

Some of the ways that we try to combat some of that stuff, as I said, is we show them this film, "Anatomy of A Lie" and we talk to the people. We tell them if they start showing the slide presentation, to furnish popcorn during the Saturday night horror stories and get that type of momentum going on your side. If they will do it, prompt the committee to get up and ask questions. When they start talking about plants closing, ask your committee to stand up and say, "Mr. Bossman, are you saying that if we vote the union in you are going to close the plant up? Please say yes or no." That's something we did for a long time -- prompt our committee to get up in their meetings and ask questions.

One day in Wallace and Cheraw, South Carolina, where two J. P. Stevens plants' elections were scheduled, we asked our committee to get up and ask the boss some questions, and before the day was over, we had 22 people fired. We lost the case before the Board. We think it is a bad decision, but they did rule that they were engaged in a concerted effort to bust up the company's meeting.

Let me talk about some of the more positive things that we have been able to use. I believe that when you first engage in a campaign, normally, it is at the request of the workers. They call our office every time something happens that they don't like. Usually, we will get a call from somebody saying that there is an interest for the union. But once we get the committee set up, a lot of times we use petitions and at the top of the petitions it simply says that"this will authorize the United Steelworkers or the Molders or the Textile Workers to represent me in collective bargaining. This will also authorize the said union to use my name for the purpose of organizing "X" Plant. This may include sending my name to the company with a copy to the National Labor Relations

Board. You now leave a spot on the petition for the name, address, rate of pay, etc. Often times during the course of the campaign, a lot of people will be willing in the beginning, and unless you have obligated them pretty well and have them committed pretty well, you lose the election. You hear about having 70 or 80 percent of them signed up and getting 40 percent of the vote.

I found it to be pretty beneficial to give them a booster shot right before they go into the booth. I remember one in Pageland, South Carolina that I ran for the IBEW. I never even assigned an organizer to them. They met with the workers; they put out all the leaflets. I used this type of petition. The election started at 1:00 p.m.. We had a pre-election conference at 12:30 p.m. and the people had lunch from 12:30 to 1:00 p.m. So, while we were in the pre-election conference, these girls passed out a leaflet that had a picture of the workers at a meeting holding up their hand like that -- "V" for victory. "We all want to show South Carolina Electric today that we're just as good as they are up in New Jersey. They had another plant in New Jersey that had better wages and benefits. We were going to send them a message. That message is, "We are just as good in Pageland, South Carolina as they are in Trenton, New Jersey." We won that election 125 to 46. The attorney was Ogletree, who is representing J. P. Stevens right now.

Another thing that we try to do whenever we can is to use check-off cards. When we sign up the people initially, the union has a card. If they don't, I try to get them to design one that will authorize the union to represent them and will authorize the deduction of union dues. So you tell the people from the start that you charge dues and no organization can operate without dues. We are not there just to hold an election. We are there to build a union. We want you to have a contract and in order to do that, we think you ought to pay dues. In some cases, in the smaller unions, I have actually heard of them paying initiation fees to start with and using that as an authorization. A lot of unions will exonerate them from the first month's dues once they get a contract.

It is good, I think, to have workers and workers' committees to set up a victory celebration. Everybody wants to be a winner. In the campaign that I mentioned down in Pageland, South Carolina, workers put up $3.00 to buy a fish supper the night before the election. A lot of people have them afterwards. But in this particular case, we had one the night before and it turned out well.

Thank you.

Allen Zack
Assistant Director
AFL-CIO Public Relations Department

Missouri Right-To-Work Campaign

The first thing that you have to understand about Missouri is that there were many campaigns that went on for a period of almost one year in length. First, there was the fight in the legislature to keep the "right-to-work" bill bottled up. Secondly, there was the fight to keep it off the ballot -- the anti-petition drive which reved up our troups and got them involved and active on the local level. Then, there was the legal fight -- the fight in the courts to, first, keep it off the ballot; and, then, to get it off the ballot.

This legal hassle uncovered fraud and another questionable practice by the other side which proved very damaging to their cause. It also delayed their fund raising to some extent; it also delayed ours. One important court decision was that national unions did not have to hold national membership meetings to authorize contributions into Missouri. We went into court and said it was impossible for the AFL-CIO to find an auditorium big enough for its 14 million to vote on whether they wanted to spend $50,000 in Missouri.

The actual election campaign -- the media part of it, the glamour part of it -- did not begin until after Labor Day. And it was totally built on efforts that had gone before. Many of you have seen the "rip-off" theme, the "rip-off" hats, the "rip-off" shirts, the bumper strips -- those bumper strips were on every union car in Missouri.

Union members and their families, which an early poll taken in March had shown us to be quite split and confused on the issue, began to pull together during this time. They became more educated as to the bread-and-butter issue that was involved.

I think you should understand that labor's role in campaigns -- and I have been campaigning on behalf of the labor movement since 1962 -- is generally limited to doing our own thing with our own members. We don't get involved with hiring fancy consultants, because we are not in that business. We don't normally go to the general public. We don't need advertising agencies and the like. But in Missouri we had to do all this, which was a little bit new, a little bit foreign. In terms of our advertising, we set up our own advertising agency -- and I could take a whole day to talk to you about that. For the first time, the labor movement was using some outside help, but primarily it's own staff in setting up its own advertising agency that controlled most of the materials that went out. It saved us a great deal of money. It also guaranteed us the type of time and commitment from the individuals involved that was absolutely crucial to the campaign. We made the decision on Thursday to open this agency and on Monday the doors opened and it was fully staffed. The people worked around the clock.

Now, the Missouri AFL-CIO hired Matt Reese as their political consultant to run a program of contacts with the general public. He did some voter registration in the period from Labor Day until October 11 when the rolls closed. But mostly the program was aimed at identifying potential areas of support and reaching those people with special messages.

Now, Matt used a new system never before used in political campaigns. It's called "Claritas" or Cluster Group Information. In essence, this takes the normal demographic materials -- the information that you see as the result of any poll, what people from 20-24 think, what people from 20-24 who earn under $20,000 think, what people 20-24 who earn under $20,000 and have three children think -- and it combines this information with Census data and with marketing data to find the 300,000 blocks, actually an average block is four square blocks, where these folks are likely to congregate. Now, instead of simply identifying favorable voters and undecided voters -- which we all know is one of the nuts-and-bolts things in politics -- where your tools are the telephone book and the voter registration list, this time we pulled a representative sample of the people in Missouri in each one of the 39 cluster groups in Missouri. Then we determined what clusters were potentially most favorable to us and which arguments had the greatest appeal to them, what issues they were concerned about. Then we could go to these people with special messages.

The computer also gave us the names, addresses and phone numbers of registered voters living in these clusters. Obviously, there are going to be exceptions in every cluster -- the trade unionist who's working and his wife is working and maybe they came into a little money from an inheritance and maybe they are living in an upper-middle class cluster -- there are exceptions, yes. But basically, the cluster groups take people down to the lowest common demoninators.

So, when we started out telephoning, calling to determine who would be a favorable voter, we were starting in areas that were potentially going to be most favorable to us anyway because of certain economic and sociological reasons.

Now, each voter that we identified as a favorable voter got as many as ten separate telephone or mail contacts from us. We used the cluster data also in conjunction with our media campaign, since we wanted to concentrate our efforts where we were strongest or had the greatest chance of picking up votes rather than in areas where the other side was strongest. Matt Reese calls it "letting sleeping dogs lie". We didn't want to rile the other side up with ads and put them on the defensive and drag them out to the polls in greater numbers than we could overcome.

At this point I am going to ask Walter Davis to outline our radio and television media campaign for you.

Walter L. Davis,
Special Assistant to the President,
Retail Clerks International Assoc.

Missouri Campaign to Defeat Right-to-Work--Radio and Television Media Campaign

I ran a campaign against right-to-work in Ohio in 1958, and if I recall correctly, 20 years ago I made a similiar presentation to this same group on what a great thing it was winning in Ohio. I come back here now for an encore 20 years later and I guess what bugs me about the whole process is that we don't really seem to learn a lot from our successes. We don't profit from it the way we should.

We didn't profit from it in Ohio because I recall in Ohio we got so busy politicking after the campaign had been won and fighting with each other that we destroyed the organization that made the victory possible. The other thing that I think is important is that this happens so seldom, a crisis like Missouri, like Ohio, that we really don't recognize in ourselves our own really amazing creativity, and it's there in the labor movement. Our own unbelievable tenaciousness and our own unbelievable will to win and our basic willingness to sacrifice for the common good -- I think these are things we kind of dismiss because we apparently hate to glorify ourselves.

In Missouri we forged an amazing blueprint for victory. We should profit from it. We should profit from it in more than just a political sense. It does teach us how to win politically. It does teach us how to win with an issue. If you can win with an issue, you can with a candidate.

We can translate this victory into organizing success and we can translate it into collective bargaining success if we put in the same kind of genius as we put into this campaign.

If there is one thing in Missouri that really almost destroyed us, it was a very simple one: Time.

A net result was that we wound up on October 1 and did not have one radio spot produced. We didn't have one television spot produced. We had no newspaper ads produced. We had nothing. So, we started from scratch.

I would like to pay my own personal tribute to Peter Vogt and Sherry Jones the two people who put together our television package. They put together and got on the air in a matter of two weeks a package of television spots that were puregenius.

I am not going to go into a long commentary on them. I am going to play two of the spots. After this lecture is over, we are going to play all of the spots for those who would like to see them.

The first spot is our voting booth spot and this was simply to show them how to vote "no". This got very heavy play in the later stages of the campaign. The key spot in the whole campaign (this was done in minute form and this was done in 30 second form) is our Harry Truman spot. The smartest thing we did in the whole campaign was to go with Harry Truman. We didn't have any other alternative, if you want to know the truth, but here are those two spots and then I will come back and play you some of the radio spots.

--Television Spots Played--

There is another side of the coin and the other side of the coin is radio. Allen Zack and I both think radio is a pretty important media, but not everybody seems to agree on that. Basically, what we spent was $125,000 on television and $79,000 on radio, but for $79,000 on radio you get tons of spots and an awful lot of coverage. The radio spots originally produced didn't really satisfy me at all. We had voice montages, and there were catch phrases, and right-to-work doesn't lend itself to catch phrases. This is what I call the "cutesy voice montage," and then I will tell you why I think it wouldn't work.

--Radio Spot Played--

What do I think is wrong with this spot? Well, the voices and the accents come at you too fast. There is a lack of continuity. One of the things that you have to bear in mind when you are dealing with radio is that you are talking about the car radio basically. You don't listen to radio much unless you are in that kind of an atmosphere. Somebody did a survey recently and they found 75% of care radios were on full bass and no treble. Which means that it's like somebody talking with their head in a barrel. It is the worst kind of reproduction.

So, what you have to do is take your spots and build them so they are crisp and clean and clear. Be sure to use professional voices. It's worth it. Paying the rate is worth it many times over for what you get. Don't try to do it "in-house." That's a plug for my union, AFTRA.

So, we did decide to produce our own spots. The best of the lot for my money was a thing I call my "Grandpa" spot. You have to be a grandpa to write this copy but it really came easy. It's got the world's worst "cornpone" story in it -- you have all heard it. It has a character who has a voice quality: it's very interesting. There are enough people in the room who will recognize the voice. He was one of the three "Shadow" voices on radio. This is Grayson Enlow, and Grayson does the Grandpa routine for us.

--Radio Spot Played--

I might explain that he is a member of the Kansas City local of AFTRA. He lives there. He is a native and he says "Missoura" not "Missouri" you will notice. Now to show you how you can extend this a little. We developed Grandpa into a character that we kept on using repeatedly, and he became a symbol. He was the voice of reason that came through speaking through us. He delighted us, and we were so impressed that when we got into the campaign just a month or so ago in New Mexico in a legislative hastle over right-to-work we went back and used him again. We went up to Kansas City and produced a set of spots and here is one of those spots.

--Radio Spot Played--

Another winner we had in our radio campaign is one that we had a long, hard fight over. And I mean this was a real hard-nosed struggle. This guy's name was Slim Wilson, and the President of our Local in Springfield came up with him. Slim started off 25 years ago with a syndicated television show down in Springfield and later it was syndicated all over the state. Everybody in the state knows Slim Wilson. He is a country and western character. He is just a simple, uncomplicated man who walked the plank for us when it would have been the worst kind of business for him to do. He is the number one television attraction in the City of Springfield and he endangered every account he had when he took up our side.

I produced these two spots you are about to hear in the office of our Local union President on this piece of equipment, took it up to Kansas City and had it juiced up, and this became our number one hit on country and western radio in the State of Missouri.

--Radio Spots Played--

He gets better. I have another one.

--Radio Spot Played--

We had to pursuade our Washington-type city slickers that this was a good idea. And they hated those two spots. But we won. In fact, he was so good that I produced two television spots that said exactly the same thing, and we used those the last two weeks of the campaign.

Another problem that we had that was just not recognized and not well understood was the whole question of Black radio. You talk to many people about Black radio and they say "What's that?" And you talk to many political types about Black radio, and you say "What are you going to use for Black radio?" They say, "We will use what we use for anything else."

Let me let you in on a secret. Black folks know when whitey is talking to them. You can get a Black voice and convince white folks that he is White, but you can't work it the other way. What you need to do is you need to deal with the Black media as selectively as you would any other media.

What we did was produce a set of spots in which we used Coretta King, Dorothy Height of the National Council of Negro Women, Bayard Rustin and Ben Hooks of the NAACP. Now those are national figures. I don't think they have the greatest possible appeal.

We had two very important Black radio stations -- one in St. Louis and one in Kansas City. So, I went into both of those places and sat down and produced a series of spots using the Black leadership in those two places, and those were the spots we used. Here is Reverend Gillespie.

--Radio Spot Played--

There is a footnote to this which I think is important. I am sure that if we put together the appropriate committee in the Black community, that we could produce a series of spots that would call for registration and would call to get out and vote. And you could get them on Black radio absolutely free as long as we produce something that was different and unusual and had some appeal to it. The radio stations would fall all over themselves to use this stuff because they want to be for the right kinds of things. I say that and hope the national COPE is listening, and I hope we can get that kind of thing put together. I am sure there are enough forces that could do it well.

One of the really high points came when Senator Kennedy came to Columbia, Missouri (the University area there) for a rally. Now, we had a problem with the Senator that particular day, he was suffering from back pain, and I would say he was not up to his usual self and didn't make the world's greatest presentation. We got great coverage in the media on that, everything you could ask in the way of coverage was there. I wanted some special treatment. I wanted to produce a radio spot and I wanted to produce a television spot.

A newsclip was produced on television but nothing was done with the radio at all. I sent for the tape, the audio tape. I went to Kansas City and spent three hours locked in the recording studio there with a razor blade in hand and produced the one minute spot that is really a whole bunch of bits and pieces thrown together.

--Spot Played--

I would like to spend a few minutes talking about what I regard as the most effective but the least understood tool of the entire campaign. It's that thing I talked about in the beginning, the beeper. It's a very old political tool. There is nothing new about it. I guess the guy who perfected it and really made it work the best was Bobby Kennedy who used it with great effectiveness in 1967.

The White House has stumbled onto this thing too and they have just recently started to use this device. It is interesting how what I call the "beeper" is now called a "voice-wrap-around actuality." I didn't really know that was what it was, but I guess that is what you could call it if you wanted to be extremely accurate.

So, how did the beeper get it's name? It used to be when you were calling into a radio station, and they were taping you, the telephone company and the FCC insisted that you had to put a "beep" on every ten seconds so that people would know that they were being tape recorded.

The rules were relaxed later on, and now the device is still called a "beeper." It's a voice actuality being recorded by the radio station, and it comes in over the telephone usually. But, you don't have to put the beep on it any more.

What's the technique? It is not very complicated. You record an event and put an open and close on it and then you offer this "beeper" to radio stations around the state.

What do you need? Basically you need a WATS line, so you don't have to pay long-distance telephone charges; you need a hookup that allows you to plug a tape recorder directly into the line. If you go directly into the line, you get broadcast quality.

We did that and we were headquartered in Jefferson City, the state capital, and the folks who operated this thing for us tell me that we scored regularly on 2/3rds of the 182 radio stations in the state. This means that 2/3rds of the stations were playing what we sent to them regularly; some would play it one time only and others would play it all day. If we had something that was reasonably good they play it all day.

We had another situation that made it easy for us to have this. In Missouri they have a thing called "Missouri Net" which is the major radio stations hooked together. If they took it, that meant one call covered 37 stations. If they decided they didn't want that particular beeper, we just simply called all 37 of those stations.

What was the cost of the beepers to us? Nothing. These were news events that we were supplying to the radio stations. What did it cost to produce the things? Well, you need a reel-to-reel tape recorder and cassette recorder. You need an editing block. You need splicing tape. And you need a razor blade, preferably a single edge.

Doug Frazier came to Missouri the Sunday a week before the election. They had him set up in St. Louis and Kansas City. He came into St. Louis on Saturday and he was a winner. It was a great turnout. When he got to Kansas City, it went all down hill. There weren't enough people to fill up one-tenth of the hall. It was held in virtual secrecy, except for the fact that I was there with my trusty reel-to-reel tape recorder. I put an open and close on it and this is what we pumped out on all the stations that Sunday.

--Beeper Played--

Out of that same meeting we got a spin off -- another beeper. Bruce Watkins is City Councilman in Kansas City, and he came to address the rally too. Bruce is black and he is currently running for Mayor of Kansas City. We took what Bruce had to say and sent that out to the Black stations in Kansas City and St. Louis.

--Beeper Played--

There are other aspects of the media campaign. We had our share of newspaper ads. We made reproduced copies available. Local unions, instead of running some home-made ads, did condescend to run ours. We were the better for it.

There was a battle of yard signs. I think that is probably the least effective political tool, next to the bumper sticker, in the history of mankind. The basic ingredient is the people ingredient. They understood the threat finally, and they made the difference. We can all continue to savor that glorious 60% victory because of them.

Thank you.

Mary Elkuss, Education Director,
S.W. Regional Joint Board,
Amalgamated Clothing and
Textile Workers Union

The Missouri Campaign to Defeat Right-To-Work

I think the story of what union members did in the state of Missouri to defeat "right-to-work" has not been told enough. There were so many facets to this great victory and so many people contributed that sometimes we tend to overlook the fact that if we hadn't rallyed our members and gotten them out to do the beautiful job they did, we might not have won.

My contribution to this panel is to tell you what our particular union, the S.W. Regional Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, did in the smaller towns and the rural areas of Missouri. Also, I will bring out what role the Education Department of a union could play and did play. It just so happens that the Education Department of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union in Missouri, the apparel part of it, consists of just two people, Ros Denaci and myself. Just to give you a little idea of how strong the ACTWU is in Missouri, we have 48 locals. Thirty eight of them are located in smaller towns or rural areas. These 38 are located in 26 different counties. Out of those 26 counties, we won (and I am just talking about counties where there is not a major city) in 17. And in 5 more, we just lost by 1 or 2 percentage points. We got 48 or 49 percent of the vote.

Very early on the Education Department of ACTWU could see the handwriting on the wall as to the dangers of the "R-T-W" movement and tried to sound the alarm. We found there was a tendency to believe it wasn't a threat; that "right-to-work" couldn't pass; and the people pushing the petitions wouldn't be successful and wouldn't get it on the ballot. Then after it did get on the ballot, there was a feeling of pessimism -- it couldn't be beaten. But those of us in the Education Department and some of our leadership felt that we certainly could beat it. So, we set out to do that.

About 9 or 10 months before the election we started conducting education programs at our district meetings and in our local union meetings. We produced a discussion outline for our local union leadership and for business agents. I was hoping that it could be reproduced for this meeting. I thought perhaps it would be useful to the Education people here. I have a copy in case anybody wants to see it and it could still be reproduced. At the end of the outline, we have a brief history of the Right-To-Work Committee. We set out early to set up committees to fight "right-to-work" in all our local unions. We got out several simple leaflets -- and they have been reproduced here -- they are not in the color that they originally had -- one blue and one red, white, and blue -- I am not going to read over these at this point. You can pick them up. But, the purpose of these leaflets was to reach our own members. We had discovered that what the polls showed and especially one that was done for the St. Louis Labor Tribune about our members being thoroughly confused over what "right-to-work" was all about was correct. Since that poll hasn't been referred to yet this evening I would just like to read you two questions that were on it. "Do you feel that Missouri should have a right-to-work law?" And 66% said "yes." 13% said "no." 21% had no opinion. Then in contrast to that: "Should a worker be required to join the union in order to receive the benefits which the union gains from the company for its member." And there, 59% said "yes" and 41% said "no."

So, you can see the utter confusion. That's one of the reasons why our Education Department got out leaflets for our members in the beginning. We also did something that I think goes back to the Ohio campaign years ago. That was we produced little calling cards saying, "Right-to-work really means right to work for less. It will hurt me and hurt your business. Members of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union." Then on the other side, "Unions are good for your business. My union wages make it possible for me to buy more from you." And we encouraged our members whenever they bought anything to leave one of these cards behind -- whether it was groceries, dry-goods, clothes, gasoline, whatever -- and to put them in an envelope when they paid their bills. It was widely used and it was quite effective.

Another thing we did was to try to identify the enemies of the labor movement as the corporations and to show that the people who were supporting "right-to-work" were against the things the labor unions stood for and needed very badly. I don't think it is common knowledge that the State of Missouri has no state minimum wage law. It's one of seven states that still doesn't. Every year we try to get one passed. Every year we are defeated. It just so happend that a state minimum wage bill was voted on fairly early in the last session of the legislature and again was defeated. Ten of eleven sponsors of the "right-to-work" bill in the legislature helped defeat the state minimum wage bill. So, we got out a leaflet on that, too. We found that was tremendously effective.

You've heard a lot about what sophisticated media can do. Some things we did will probably sound kind of childish in comparison although they were very effective. We suggested to our members that they make, what we call, "lapel signs" to be pinned on their person. Some of our members actually designed them and we xeroxed them and distributed them widely. The local unions would pick the one they liked best and color them. So they did that.

This one is a firecracker (the firecracker is "right-to-work) and it's blowing up job security, better wages, power to bargain; and it says "Don't destroy what you have now."

Here's another one with a boot ("right-to work" stepping on the State of Missouri) saying "Don't let them step on you."

We encouraged our people to wear these in the shop and they did. I am sure you can imagine what happened. People walked up to them and said, "What's that crazy thing you are wearing?" Instead of them having to go seek people out, people came to them. It gave them an opportunity to talk to their members about "right-to-work" and to find out where they were at. It is really an effective technique. So, those are some of the things we did very early on.

When the petition drive started we got out other special leaflets. This leaflet has not been reproduced here but it could be if any of you wanted it. We took the firecracker idea and put it on a leaflet and said "Be smart. Beware. Don't sign away your future." And then there is a little bit about the petition drive.

Along with this leaflet went an instruction sheet telling what to do when one of our members found someone circulating the petition. We encouraged them to talk to the petition circulator nicely, not to get into a fight and find out all they could about them. Here are a few of the things the leaflet suggested they ask:

-What is his/her name?
-Where is he/she from?
-How long have they been doing this?
-Where does he/she plan to do it in the future?
-Who asked them to do it?
-Is he/she being paid? By the hour? By the names?
-Does he/she support the right-to-work law?

We found out many students were being used especially in shopping centers and supermarkets and places like that. And when our members talked to them, some began to have second thoughts about what they were doing. Of course, the students needed the money badly and I don't know how many of them actually stopped this activity. But, they did begin to have some inkling of the significance of what they were doing.

Then our members also would stand next to the petition circulator with leaflets, and give a person who was going to sign the petition one of the leaflets saying, "How about reading this before you sign the petition?" The reports we received were that this was very effective.

We started early to get our people registered. They had to be registered, of course, before October 11. We did the usual things. I am not going into how you run a registration campaign because everybody here knows. I have one of the forms along with me if you want to see it. But, I would like to tell you that we have never come so close to being 100% registered in all our shops. And, I am talking about the shops in the small town areas and rural areas. It was not easy because often there were many different towns involved, different counties, and our committees had to go locate all that registration information and get it to the shops. It was a major effort and they went all out and did a tremendous job.

Then, of course, after the "right-to-work" people did get their amendment on the ballot, we really had to step up the campaign. Rosilyn and I, except the week of our Convention, spent from the first of September to the Election entirely in Missouri traveling from local to local. We made just about every local meeting. And then doubled back over some of them. I think the role of the Education Department was tremendously important. Not that the regular staff wasn't doing what they could, but to have somebody come in from the outside, almost like a Paul Revere and sound the alarms sort of helped to stir people up more.

We didn't have any kind of regular formula that we followed in discussing the danger of "right-to-work" we would do just what I said, sound the alarm -- "We are under attack!" We tied the "right-to-work" movement to the whole attack on the labor movement that we have been hearing about here today. And we were saying "Right now Missouri is on the front line. How this battle goes may be determined in our State."

Next we identified the enemy. One of the things I think that came out very clearly in the Missouri campaign was that the "right-to-work" ball was being pushed by the corporate interests. One of the things that helped us there was that Missouri campaign finance laws require big contributors to declare their contributions and the St. Louis Post Dispatch, which to my knowledge was the only newspaper in the state that actually came out against "right-to-work" , published them.

Just to give you an example, those of you who have been in the labor movement as long as I have know about the Eagle - Pitcher Company in the Joplin area and its awful anti-labor history. This company was one of the big contributors! Kansas City Life Insurance also. Many companies like that contributed to "right-to-work" and we were able to make clear to our members who was behind this effort. I really think that was terribly important. If any of you eat Mrs. Allyson's cookies, I hope you won't any more because they were one of the big contributors to the "right-to-work" campaign.

Then, the next thing that we tried to do was to tell the members what it would be like if they got a "right-to-work" law in Missouri. There we had the advantage of the fact that Rosilyn and I both work in Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi and some of the other states that have to contend with "right-to-work". So, we were able to paint a very vivid picture of what would happen and many of them really hadn't faced that before -- what it would mean to operate under a right-to-work law. We told them that from then on they could never be sure that they would have a majority in the union because there was no way, of course, that they could see to it that all the new people coming in would have to join the union.

It's kind of a policy in the labor movement not to reveal, or not to make public speeches about the fact that we have to provide services for the non-union people in "right-to-work"states exactly the same as we do for the union members. Of course, they get all the benefits. Well, when our people heard that they really hit the ceiling. We did talk about that openly and we really had to at that point, pointing out that it didn't matter whether we told people they were going to get the benefits whether they joined the union or not because the company tells them.

We have one company that we deal with in Arkansas that's made a movie listing all the contract benefits without giving the union credit. The company shows it to every new person they hire and then takes all the credit for the benefits that are in that contract. They let them know, of course, they don't have to join the union. We would ask our Missouri members: "If you are going to get all the benefits and you are going to get all the services, be honest, what are you going to do?" They saw the point.

We also pointed out that "right-to-work" gives a weapon to the companies to use to tear up a union, or at least to keep the workers fighting all the time because good union people, and there are plenty of them in "right-to-work" states, can't stand the "free-loaders."

71

We pointed out that they not only had to make sure that every one of their members understood what was at stake but they had to go to the public too because it was going to be the public that really decided this issue. We got out several leaflets that were directed to the public. We had one of them reproduced and you can pick it up. Actually we developed two, one headed "Why John Q. and Mary Z. Public Should Be Against 'Right-to-Work'". On this one we tried to emphasize how undemocratic a "right-to-work" law was. The other: "Most People You Elect To Top Office In Missouri Are Against the So-Called 'Right-to-Work' Laws." The Governor came out with a strong statement against "right-to-work", also both Senators (even though one is a Republican) and seven of the ten Congressmen. Another person who is revered in Missouri almost as much as Harry Truman was the late Congressman Jerry Litton, who had written shortly before the airplane accident that took his life, saying that he was against "right-to-work" and we had that on this leaflet too.

Other unions, of course, created leaflets that were very useful and I would like to just tell you about one that the Service Employees Union got out. Our members liked this one very much and it was used widely in the rural areas: "Keep The Unions Strong. Labor Unions Benefit You and Your Family Even If You Don't Belong." And it lists social security, public schools, workmens' compensation, and so on and so forth -- the social legislation that most people take for granted without realizing that the labor movement played a tremendous role in getting them on the books.

Then there was another leaflet that a citizen's committee got out called "Bad Medicine For Missouri." Our members used this widely. One of the groups that we found who liked that leaflet very much were the churches.

We really developed, I think, a tremendous grass-roots movement. They did a lot of things that we usually associate with a campaign like this one and also came up with many original ideas. In many of our unions we had a core of members who went every weekend from door to door, not only in their own neighborhoods but also far afield, even to other counties. We practiced ahead of time what they would say when they knocked on somebody's door, and I think that helped a lot. They took phone books (some of these small towns' phone books aren't very big) tore them apart and called every single person in that phone book and then they called them again!

If there was a parade any where in the area they latched on to that parade, decorating trucks and cars with plaques making them look attractive.

If they couldn't get into the parade they made use of the parade. To give you an example, there is a college in Cape Girardeau where they had a homecoming parade, we couldn't get into the parade but our folks were all over the streets with their handbills talking to the people watching. They lined up a lot of students to help. Our experience was that the students basically were more with us than they were against us. And in the Cape Girardeau area many of our members had gone to the college there or were actually taking courses at that time and they rounded up many of the students to help them.

I could tell you many other things that they did but just wanted to give you a feeling for this spontaneous outpouring of activity and concern. I think one thing we have to realize is that our members often gripe that the union doesn't do this and doesn't do that, but in Missouri they had to re-evaluate how they felt about their union. When it got down to the nitty-gritty they decided they didn't want to do without their union.

One other little thing that helped tremendously, I think, and this is one of the big mistakes that the "right-to-work" people made, the way the amendment was worded indicated that any contract with a union security clause would be null and void if this amendment was passed. So, we took that wording and blew it up and put an arrow pointing to those words: "This is how the so-called 'right-to-work' amendment will appear on the November 7 ballot." I would like to read you that wording, "...and any contract that contravenes this right is illegal and void." So, you know that was a little scary to our members. They didn't want to be without those contracts.

At the Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers in September, we passed a resolution that was quite helpful bringing out rather clearly the fact that we didn't know what was going to happen to the contracts if Amendment 23 passed. I would like to read you a couple of sentences from that resolution:

> By use of dishonest appeals to the American tradition of freedom, a vote has been forced in an effort to destroy the right of Missouri workers to freely contract for their conditions of employment. The real issue is not right to work, the real issue is the right to contract. We believe the people in Missouri will decisively reject the phony arguments, the dishonest slogans and reaffirm the rights of American workers to join hands in unions to freely contract for the terms and conditions of their employment.

And here is the important thing:

> But a great danger lurks in this vote. Should the voters of Missouri fail to see the real issue and endorse the repressive proposition, the stability and industrial peace in that State could be

> shattered. As written the proposition appears to make illegal all contracts under which Missouri union members work. The health security and pension benefits of Missouri workers under these contracts would end until new contracts could be negotiated. Industrial production of that State could halt until Missouri union workers following the tradition of no contract, no work, could secure new contractual contension through the often drawn-out process of collective bargaining.

We used that resolution to great effect too. One or two more words and then I will conclude.

Just to give you some idea of the concern that members developed -- after one meeting, one night, with one local down in the "boot hill" I went into the plant the next morning and a white-haired lady came running up to me and said, "I couldn't get to the meeting last night but I want to volunteer to go door to door." She was an elderly lady. "I don't want my grandchildren to have to fight for a union like I had to."

Some of the workers in Aurora, Missouri got together with other unions. This was referred to earlier and I would like to mention it again. Our local unions discovered other unions! That is really true. I think that for a long time many of our ACTWU locals in rural areas thought they were the only union in the area. But, through this campaign, they began to find other unions and other union members. In Aurora, and this is just one example, they got together and put an ad in the paper: "Don't be Fooled!" And, using some of the words that we had on our leaflets, "These people you elected are against the so-called 'right-to-work' amendment." And then listed names of the officials. On the bottom it read: "This ad paid for by the area wage earners." The unionists took up collections. The money didn't come out of their treasuries, but they took up collections to get that ad in the paper. It ran for a couple of weeks.

Some of the other things that you were told about here today were done all over the state. As an educational worker I want to say that as I worked one of the most supportive things was to hear some of these "spots" and to see some of the television programs, and also visual evidence that we were making progress in this fight.

In the beginning some of us thought that the "rip-off" bumper strips were kind of foolish because you see a car tearing down the highway and all you could see was "Rip-Off" and how are you going to find out what this is all about. But, believe me, as the bumper stickers and signs started to multiply and they became very, very visible, then it made you feel that the working people in Missouri were a real force.

I went into one meeting toward the end of the campaign and about 60 people were there and every single one of them had a badge on. I still don't know where they got them. It read, "Vote 'No' -- Amendment 23." Imagine walking into a hall with everybody sitting very proudly with that badge on!

Another little town close to the "boot hill" called "Delta" -- there couldn't be more than 20 houses and two or three stores there -- and everyone of them had lawn signs or a sign on the house or the barn saying "Vote No!"

So, by the time I headed home to get ready for the election I was sure we were going to win. I got a big kick on election night when Senator Paul Dietrich, who was one of the leaders of what they called "The Freedom-of-Work" movement, said "Ok, they are winning in Kansas City and St. Louis, but wait until those small towns and rural areas come in." And I said to myself, "Buddy, you are going to have a surprise." And he sure did.

Karen Chaikin, Coordinator,
American Histadrut Cultural
Exchange Institute

When I heard about this conference I immediately asked Walter if I could both come and attend as well as speak with you. After all, we are in the same line of business, that is; educating others about a free trade union movement. Although I come from a strong labor background, I knew I had a great deal to learn from you, and at the same time, I wanted to tell you something about the work that we do at the American Histadrut Cultural Exchange Institute.

Histadrut is the general federation of labor in Israel. But instead of going into detail about it, I will ask that you go to classroom "C" where I have set up a literature table and you can pick up some things about Histadrut.

For now, I want to discuss some of our programs which serve to promote a better understanding of Israel and the general federation of labor there. One of the programs we have is a series of roundtable discussions. The last one we had featured Dr. Judah Shapiro who spoke on "New Year's Prospects for Peace in the Middle East." We are now planning another one to discuss the economic situation in Israel at the present time.

At the Institute we are constantly in touch with various communities. One of these groups is the Youth Institute for Peace in the Middle East. This is an organization of young trade unionists and students across the country as well as other concerned individuals for a free, secure, democratic Israel. Last fall we co-sponsored an all day educational seminar which presented a comparative study of the American and Israeli trade union movements and a discussion of the military and political implications of the Camp David agreements. We are also in touch with representatives of the Black and Hispanic community. Just recently we had a very, very special meeting of our Cross-cultural Exchange Subcommittee. Some of those present were Bayard Rustin and Norman Hill from A. Philip Randolph Institute, Leon Lynch from the Steelworkers, Bob Powell from the Laborers, Roy Kirkley who is with us tonight as well as Manny Gonzalez from the ILG and Bill Ross from RTP. Together, through informal discussion we explored the many questions that were on all of our minds; questions about Israel, about American Foreign Policy, about how Blacks and Hispanics view Israel, where they see problems and what they regard as strengths. Many of these people had indeed visited Israel and met with Histadrut representatives there. They had a lot to say -- all the while savoring their memories, their positive impressions and perceptions of a strong trade union movement in a strong and democratic state. And we discussed how very important, how totally necessary it is that the rest of the community know and understand the issues. As a result of that meeting, I have already put together some pieces of literature for distribution, and I hope to set up informal sessions whereby some of those people present at that meeting would get together in a session open to the general community at large and relay the message that together, as a small group, had discussed.

Walter already mentioned it but one of the things we did last May was co-sponsor a week end seminar here with the AFL-CIO Department of Education, and I believe that many of you have already received the transcription of the proceedings. If you have not, again I ask that you go to the literature table and pick it up. Please read through it. I am certain you will find new pieces of information and further reasons why the American trade union movement has and should continue to be strong supporters of the Histadrut.

Which really brings me to my main point. I am aware that many of you have summer school programs and I ask you, I urge you, to consider devoting one session to the Histadrut. I can arrange for a speaker to address himself to one of a number of topics -- perhaps an historic perspective of the Histadrut or an overview of the many facets of the Histadrut today, or maybe something about the minorities in the Histadrut -- the Arabs in the Histadrut -- or perhaps the Histadrut's compelling role once peace is achieved. Whatever you want, whatever your interest, please be in touch with me. I will be here until Wednesday so just come over and give me your name and I will be in touch with you later on. I know some of you in the past have already scheduled speakers on the Histadrut and the feedback has been very positive and I ask that you continue to do it again this summer. I have already spoken with a few people and they have expressed the desire for a speaker. To the rest of you, I would truly appreciate it if you would give it a good deal of thought and come to see me.

You have also heard a little about the labor educator's exchange. I don't want to take up too much of your time as we are running late. However, you should know that we do sponsor a labor educator's trip for about 10 days to 2 weeks to Israel to meet with Histadrut representatives. If you are interested, again, come up and give me your name and either Herb or I will be in touch with you. We have a limited number of spaces but do welcome all who are interested. Again, in classroom "C" there is a literature table -- please take a look at some sketches that Norman Eiger drew when he was on the same trip as Walter Davis.

Thank you.

Albert Shanker, President,
American Federation of Teachers,
AFL-CIO

I would like to touch on a number of topics which I think have some kind of thread. I guess the thread is my interest, and your interest, in both public education and union education. I would like to start with a few of the priority problems hitting us in the public education field. Now before discussing these problems, I would like to point out that all of the major problems that we are facing in public education stem from a very radical change in the attitudes of the public toward public schools, public education, and public school teachers. If throughout most of the history of this country we had taken our Gallup or Harris polls or polls of our AFL-CIO members, we would have found that the schools were thought of as very good, important institutions. They were regarded as an avenue of mobility for most of the children of our members, and teachers were held in esteem and high regard. There is also no question that somewhere in the late 1950s or early 1960s all of that changed very rapidly, and is continuing to change.

Now there are probably as many reasons for this as there are people in this room who would care to develop theories, but I would like to suggest one overall reason for that change, and think about what that implies. Until World War II very few people in this country went to college. As a matter of fact, growing up as I did in New York in the 30s and 40s I know that huge numbers of people in the neighborhood that I grew up in did not graduate from elementary school. Those who had an elementary school diploma had an indication that they had accomplished something which many others around had not accomplished and the high school graduation was something which was quite rare. College was known only to the doctor, the dentist or the lawyer. Teachers were people who had gone to normal school or college for 1 or 2 years. Some high school teachers had actually graduated from college and had a BA. So, throughout most of the period before World War II and through World War II the overwhelming majority of people had achieved a level of education which was by present standards very, very low. At the same time, teachers who filled the public schools were among the top 5% or 3% or 4% in terms of education -- they were part of an educational elite. I suppose that the attitude of my parents was typical. I am sure it was typical of practically all the parents in the community. They thought that if we didn't go to school, we were not educated. They trusted the doctor for medical advice because the doctor was an expert. (Those were the days before malpractice became popular.) They trusted the lawyer and the dentist and the teacher as educated people. The parent regarded the teacher as someone who was going to bring "my child" away from "where I am" up to some other position.

After World War II, we got the G.I. Bill of Rights, and along with that the opening of institutions of higher education. Millions of people went to college and the percentage of those educated changed very dramatically. The result is that we no longer live in communities where teachers and doctors, lawyers and dentists compose a very small handful of people who have higher educations and who everybody else looks up to.

More and more teachers operate in communities where the majority of people have had an education that is equal to their own and in many cases greater. You now have communities where the average parent says "I could do a much better job educating my kid if I weren't busy with my job." We have gone through a transformation of attitudes as a result of opening up education and creating educational mobility. The problem this creates for educational institutions is that they lose authority; the mystique that surrounds them is lost; and they lose public respect. The average man or woman in the street now feels that it is proper to criticize and to question educational institutions in a way he or she never would have before. In a peculiar way it is the very success of educational institutions that has brought waves of criticism to public education and the schools. This means that if teachers of public education are to continue to have public support they can never again rely on the respect of a public which is by and large uneducated. Right now we are living through a kind of an adjustment period where teachers and schools haven't quite understood that the good old days are never going to return again.

The current loss of respect for the schools is resulting in a number of very serious attacks on public education. I will talk about a few of them very briefly. The most serious one, of course, is the movement for tuition tax credits. It is a movement which has been around for awhile but it became really serious for the first time last year when a bill passed the House of Representatives and failed narrowly in the Senate. It has been reintroduced this year. It will undoubtedly become part of presidential politics next year. One can easily understand why public school teachers would oppose tuition tax credits. But there are also reasons why the AFL-CIO opposes them.

Are there parents who are now somewhat dissatisfied with public schools? Sure, many of them. Are many of them considering taking their children out? Sure. Is one of the questions they ask themselves, "How much is it going to cost?" They sure do. If you say to them, "Well, we are going to help you out and give you $500.00 towards the tuition," will some parents who are interested but haven't made the move take that $500.00 and say "Okay, that does it." Yes, there are some. Is there a majority? No, I don't think so. Well, suppose it is only 5% or 6% or 7% or 10% -- it's some small percentage. The number isn't small but the percentage is small. Well which parents will take that tuition tax credit and move their children over? Is it likely to be parents who are economically poor? Probably not. They are not going to be able to dig down and get the additional money since that $500.00 was to be no more than 50%, meaning that the tuition would have to be at least $1,000 for the parent to get $500. Tuition could be even more, with the result that a poor parent would be unlikely to match that sum. Who would leave the public schools? Well, probably the most affluent would leave. When they leave what happens? Generally, student achievement test scores in reading and writing and mathematics correlate perfectly with the income of parents. This means that by taking the higher income children out of public schools that you automatically contribute to a drop in average reading and math scores. The scores will go down because those children who bring the scores up are no longer in school.

What happens next? When parents move from one town to another, part of the reason they're moving is that they want their children to sit next to other children who will be models for them. Their question is, "Which children do my children sit next to? Are they going to learn one thing that's negative or are they going to learn something else that's positive?" Children learn from each other. When you take these children from wealthier families out of the schools you make the schools less desirable. Not only that, but these children have parents who are the most politically active and politically connected. They are the ones in the PTA. They are the ones who are fighting for state aid to education and federal aid to education and all sorts of programs. If you take 5% of those parents out of the public schools and move them over to private schools, you substantially reduce the political power of the public schools to operate. The next year those parents are not going to the state and federal government and to the school board for more money for the public schools. Rather, they are going to be saying, "Hey, $500 is not enough. Give me $750 for my private school. Give me $1000. Give me the same amount that you give to a child in the public schools." There is no question that if you start giving money to parents to send their children to private schools, it will be the beginning of a process that will end public education as we know it.

We will always have a public schools sytem, to be sure. But, in that public school system will be those children who couldn't get into any private school. Remember, that is the nature of the private schools. They have the right to say no -- private schools do that. There are also the children who are too expensive to educate in public schools -- the handicapped, the emotionally disturbed. We will end up with a public school system that is the poor house.

Now what is going to happen over in the private sector? And this, it seems to me, is the major interest of the labor movement in opposing tuition tax credits. The experience in private schools will follow the experience that we have had in private health insurance. Now everybody in this room knows that once upon a time there was no private health insurance and you used to go to a doctor and the doctor charged $5.00. Then we all negotiated schemes for our workers that said if a worker goes to a doctor Blue Shield gives him $5.00. The doctor found that out and the doctor said okay now it's $10.00 and the worker still paid $5.00 but now the insurance scheme paid $5.00. So, we negotiated again and we got a $10.00 payment, but then the doctor said now it's $15.00 or $20.00. We found out that with private health insurance no matter what you negotiate the worker still has to pay something. All we've done is escalate the amount of money that the doctor, or the hospital or the laboratory gets. The worker still has to pay on top of that. This, of course, is why we are trying to change the nature of the delivery of health services.

Is there any doubt that the same thing would happen once large numbers of students left the public schools? Public schools would be closed, the buildings would be sold, the textbooks would be sold and the teachers would move over to the private sector. Eventually, we would have a very small number of public schools to take care of the disturbed and handicapped, and we would have private schools all over the lot. The private schools could charge what they want, using the tuition tax credit as a base. What we will have done is wipe out one of the major free institutions and avenues of mobility within our society and created another sort of private health insurance scheme where every worker is going to have to pay $500, $1000, or $1500 to private schools on top of the tuition tax credit. If we think first of what this means to workers and their standard of living, and then ask a second set of questions: "What is the nature of these private schools?" "Do they provide the same experience in bringing people together that the public schools have provided?" Then we can easily see why the AFL-CIO is against tax credits.

In California we have an even more serious threat -- the fathers of Proposition 13 are now supporting vouchers. With vouchers every parent gets a voucher equal to the per pupil amount spent in the public schools. This can be taken to any school to buy a child's education. It sounds like free choice. That is the beginning, but what happens after the public schools contract for this service? Is there any law that says private schools have to limit their fees? Is there any law that says that they have to educate the handicapped or provide any of the other services the public schools must provide? Not at all.

I should add one more item to the list of attacks on public education, and that is in the area of higher education. There is a tremendous movement for government help to private institutions at the expense of public institutions. That is another way of saying there is a tremendous movement to help institutions that charge high tuition and to raise tuition at public institutions. A lot of research has been done showing that for every $100 tuition is raised many people are kept out of college. The people kept out are by and large the sons and daughters of our members. Those who are in absolute poverty have access to government funds designed to help those who are very, very poor. Of course, the very rich don't have to worry. It is the people who are in between -- generally the children of workers -- who are not given that much public assistance. One proposal that has been placed before Congress comes from the New York State Board of Regents. I don't think it has a chance of going anywhere, but there are others that are similar to this that do. The New York State Board of Regents says that the federal government should give a tuition tax credit to college students in this country that amounts to 20% of the first $1,000 and 100% of any tuition above $1,000. It is quite clear what they are interested in -- they are really saying that if you are in a low tuition institution which charges $700 you are going to get $140 in help from the federal government. But, if you are an institution that charges $3000 then you will get $2,000 which is the amount over $1,000. By the way, it could be one of the most inflationary items in any education program if the federal government and state governments decide that they are going to fund very high tuitions.

Well, I said I would touch on some of the public education issues. I would like to now deal with a few issues in terms of union experience which I think will be of general interest because as far as I know some of these things are not widely done. A few years ago the teachers in New York State in the NEA and the AFT merged, and that resulted in the creation of an organization in New York State of 200,000 -- the New York State United Teachers -- the majority of them coming from the National Education Association. A number of us felt that this was a rather interesting experiment in terms of research because out of 200,000 people there were 110,000 that had been hit over a period of time with materials which were hostile to the AFL-CIO. Everytime we tried to organize them and bring them into the union they would put out literature saying that, "If you are in the AFL-CIO you will just be another worker," or "You will be forced to punch a time clock." "You won't be a professional anymore," or "George Meany will dictate to you what the teaching of a lesson is," or "If New York City goes out on strike, Buffalo will have to go out on a sympathy strike." I can put together a folder of all of their junk that was distributed in all the jurisdictional campaigns. I assure you that each and every one of the points that I just mentioned would be adequately represented by rather nice looking literature that was very carefully designed to make people feel that they were about to lose their freedom, their identity, their status. Their merger took place in 1972. In 1975 we decided we would do something to find out where our own members were because we didn't know. We had 110,000 people who had been in the Association before, and we had about 70,000 that had been in the union and we had about 40,000 or so who came in just because they were excited by the whole thing. They had never been members of anything before. We decided that if there was to be a big fight between the NEA and the AFT we needed to know where the teachers would be likely to go. How did they view the organization? So, we decided to hire Louis Harris pollsters, and they did a very widespread poll of both members and leaders. It was broken down into 17 different regions so that we could find out whether there were regional differences, differences in age, differences between men and women, and differences between those who had been in the union and those who had been in the Association. At the same time we broke out a certain number of leaders, local presidents, delegates to the state convention, and delegates to the national convention so that we could tell whether there were any major differences between the leaders and the members.

We did three additional polls this last year when we were faced with a challenge in the State University of New York, which is a unit of 16,000 professors and instructors and non-instructional professionals on campuses throughout the state of New York. We were being challenged by the National Education Association and the American Association of University Professors and we were vulnerable because when the state legislature passed an agency shop provision, 11,000 professors who had never joined AFT one day found that they were being checked off for approximately $200 a year in dues. That does something to a college professor. So, the other organization came in and capitalized on that and immediately got a show of interest and here we were faced with the possibility of losing all 16,000 because maybe the 11,000 who were now being taxed felt that their academic freedom had been violated, and would vote against us. So, in the course of that election campaign the Harris Associates did 3 polls to find our who the electorate was, where they were, and what they were thinking.

Now I talk about these polls because I think that one of the things that the labor movement, individual unions, and the AFL-CIO itself needs to do more of, is some sort of frequent polling of members. (By the way, the results of this poll are available and we could send copies to you if you ask for them.) One of the first questions we asked was, "Do you think you should be represented by a professional association or a union?" That had been a big question in the jurisdictional fight earlier. The leadership voted pretty strongly for a union, over the professional organization which showed that we had educated them in the three years of affiliation. The members were torn -- they wanted both. We then asked them a series of questions about the AFL-CIO, since for years they had been given all sorts of anti-labor material. We asked them things like, "Does the AFL-CIO help you locally?" Answer: "Yes." "Does it help you in Albany?" Answer: "Yes." "Does it help you in Washington?" Answer: "Yes." "Does it make you stronger?" Answer: "Yes."

All sorts of questions about the AFL-CIO were answered positively. Then, after you go through that whole list of questions, there is one question that is different, "Has being affiliated with the AFL-CIO lowered your prestige in the eyes of the community?" Answer: Overwhelmingly, "Yes." Well, that is a very important thing to find. I wonder how many other workers in the AFL-CIO feel that way. I don't think that it is only teachers or college professors who have these views. Could it be that all the negativity that comes out in editorials and radio and TV only affect teachers, or does it affect other workers as well? Maybe they feel, "We have to have a union," but maybe they also don't feel quite right about it because they are constantly being bombarded with the image of what the newspapers and television think a union is.

Something similar to this came out in one of our polls of the college professors. We asked -- first of all we wanted to find out whether these college professors were a liberal or conservative audience. For example, were they against the agency shop because they like Richard Viguerie, or they are "right-to-workers," or something like that. And, are they really against the agency shop? If so, which ones are against the agency shop? We asked them a number of other questions -- things like, "Do you favor national health insurance?" Eighty-two percent favor national health insurance. "Do you think that the union movement does good progressive things and fights for the underdog?" About 85% think the union movement is a good movement and has done good things for workers. "Does the union movement fight for higher education?" Answer: "Yes." An overwhelming majority said that it does good things for higher education. So, we took a number of other liberal issues and we found that we had an overwhelmingly liberal audience. Not only that, one of these polls was taken at the time of the last election when Governor Carey was running against Durea and we found that among college professors 66% voted for Carey as compared to 52% of the general electorate. Professors were much more liberal then the general population in the state, and this was true wherever they were -- even in little rural areas in old teachers' colleges, the professors were liberal. By the way, we also asked some questions on quotas. They were very strong for affirmative action and very strong against rigid quotas. That cut across ethnic groups. We got almost the same results from minority groups as from professors in general. We wanted to see whether this was in issue with the campaign. It turned out not to be an issue. Then we asked them -- remember they had already said that unions are good, and unions make you stronger -- then we asked them a question which said that, "If a union does not collect dues from everyone, is the union considerably weakened in its ability to deliver?" Eighty-five percent said, "Yes." It is considerably weakened. Next question, "Do you favor the agency shops?" Eighty-four percent said, "No," including a majority of those who are voluntary dues payers. The majority of those who are already paying opposed the imposition of a payment of dues. So, there you've got it. Two questions right next to each other -- one of them; "Will it considerably weaken the ability of the union to perform if you don't do this?" Answer: "Yes." Next, "Should you do it?" Answer: "No." And all the other questions indicate that they want the union to be strong.

Well, why do I report this? I report this because I think that very frequently we believe that our people behave and think logically and we make certain assumptions when we are in a campaign. We make assumptions that because our own members believe one thing, they will automatically move over and believe the very next thing that is so closely related to it. On dozens of items on these polls -- not just this one -- we found that first of all you have to find out what it is that the members are thinking. Then you look for what you think is a breach of logic -- a place where they did not move to a certain logical conslusion depending on what they wanted. That is a place for the union to engage in some educational work.

89

I would add a footnote to this. In some of my nastier moments I have thought of renting myself out as an advisor to Viguerie or to one of these right-wing outfits. I sit on the AFL-CIO Council and I vote for the resolutions that come out and are published, and the ones I vote for I support. I don't think that we have yet seen the most effective campaign that the right-wing can run in this country. It would be directed to labor union members. If the right-wing were to take out 5 or 6 or 7 or 10 positions that the labor movement has taken which are not necessarily the positions that our members totally support, and if Mr. Viguerie or others got a computerized mailing list of trade union members and wrote them saying "Do you know some of the AFL-CIO positions?" He might get some interesting results. We know that some of our positions are complex. For instance, we supported major parts of Carter's tax reform program before he gave up on it. We supported taxing not just the three martini lunch type of thing, but we supported removing tax incentives on mortgage payments for higher priced homes among other things.

Now, of course, what we intended to do was to change the income tax rates and make a more progressive tax structure. But, any right-wing character who wanted to go through our own program and say, "The AFL-CIO stands for these things -- if you don't like them contribute to me." This kind of vulnerability means that we need to launch a major campaign to make sure our own members fully understand our positions. I would submit that without a tremendous amount of effective education within our own ranks, the right-wing could have a pretty successful time among union members.

There is one other item that I want to add to these thoughts on union education and that also relates to an experience in New York State. Since 1972 the 200,000 teachers in New York State have contributed voluntary COPE funds ranging from a minimum of $400,000 a year to a maximum one year of about $700,000. Al Barkan tells me this is a record for any union, anywhere. I raise this in a union education context because, as you know, throughout most of that period of time we have operated under an open shop. Our people are all civil servants. You know all the arguments about tenure. Our members have tenure. This means none of them feel that the union has special power to affect their lives positively or negatively. When they contribute large sums of money to COPE they are doing it because they have been reached and they have been educated. One of the things that I think that we ought to be doing is taking the successful experiences around the country with voluntary collections and contributions and finding out why it is that those members contribute and why it is that they participate politically.

One of the things that we can do in response to the Viguerie's of the country -- one of the things I guess we have done and which I am not in very much sympathy with -- is to shout about the tremendous power that the right-wing has and how they are taking over the country with computers. Now, what is the right-wing doing? I think that the right-wing is doing exactly what the labor movement has been doing all the years it has been effective. We have a computer. We have membership lists. We have issues. If they have done well for a few years, maybe it is because they have copied us and maybe in copying us they have sharpened the thing up a little bit over a few years and done it a little bit better than we have.

What I am saying is that I am very skeptical of the attack that we make on groups that are collecting money and using computers, because in a sense it excuses us from doing the same kind of thing. There are things that we can do to educate and reach and mobilize our members -- the fact that the right-wing is doing it should enable us to get to our own members and say, "Look if you don't get out and do the same thing and participate and do things which you have not done up until now, you're going to be very badly hurt, because the other side has learned from us and they're doing some things that are very effective.

Now, I want to raise two other points, then I will be quiet. We are seeing many articles about the declining influence of the labor movement. I have been reading articles like this for at least 25 years. There are some things happening that hurt us. There is a movement of jobs out of the areas that are unionized. Some are moving out of the country, and others are moving south. We also know that the 1980 census is very likely to provide us with a massive redistribution of members of Congress and that the industrial north is going to lose a large number of seats, and those places in the country that are not heavily unionized are going to gain the tremendous number of seats. Therefore, unless certain other things change the labor movement is in for a rough time in Congress -- a time which will make the last 10, or 15, or 20 or 30 years look like the golden age of labor in the Congress of the United States.

One final issue is a problem which we haven't talked about very much in the labor movement. But, I think it is going to be a major topic in the next couple of years and beyond. It is quite likely that for the first time in the history of our country, we are going to go through a period of time where the standard of living of our people does not increase. As a matter of fact, we may go through a number of years where the actual standard of living decreases. The reasons are obvious. One is that we are going to be paying for our energy.

The other is also obvious. It was two weeks ago we had two Cabinet members on the same day -- Schlesinger and Brown -- saying that we may have to use armed forces to intervene to protect our energy sources in the Middle East. That was two days after they said that somebody in Iran had taken over some of our top secret material. The combination of those two things -- the fact that we are going to be shipping out a lot more of our goods and our wealth in order to pay for energy on the one hand; and secondly, that we now have two members of the Cabinet who for the first time since the end of the Vietnam War have talked about American military intervention and have thereby also raised the question of our ability to intervene militarily -- means that there is no question but that we are in for both a squeeze on energy and increase (with a few more Iran's or something like it or Afghanistan's, or Angola's or Mozambique's, etc.) in the feeling that our enemies are getting closer to us, that it is due to our weakness, and that had we been stronger or had Carter done something, things would have been different. If there is a decline in the standard of living, this will be the first time in the history of the United States when people are not saying look, "I am getting richer every year, I have a bigger house, I have a bigger car, I have move vacations, more clothing. I'll pay a little more for federal aid to education, for help for the handicapped, for college scholarship programs, for national health insurance, for social security, for a whole bunch of other things. Yes, I will share the increased wealth that I am getting."

What happens now if there isn't any increased wealth? What happens if next year or the year after that or the year after people have to live on 3% or 2% or 5% less, in real terms, than they had lived on the year before -- not just individuals who have fallen into bad times but the country as a whole. How do we hold our own members when it comes to the persuasiveness of a Proposition 13 type of mentality. If each member has to worry about coping with a little less in these other areas what happens to their support for social programs which also determine the quality of life? What is it that the AFL-CIO's own unions and labor educators can do to prepare for that?

On that happy note.......

Al Barkan, Director,
Committee on Political Education,
AFL-CIO

COPE Check-off Campaign

I have been asked to speak to you about the COPE, AFL-CIO check-off program. Before I do, a few words about background.

It is no secret that in the November 7 election, in spite of our best efforts, we lost some good friends. There are many reasons. We lost Anderson in Minnesota because of a bad internal split within the DFL. We lost Dick Clark by a combination of one-issue attacks on him. We lost Hathaway in Maine, who got hung up on an Indian land claim fight that he never was able to get out of. We lost McIntyre in New Hampshire and, by the way, this is the one state where I told President Meany and the Executive Council I wasn't particularly proud of the COPE operation. In New Hampshire,the fact is there wasn't any COPE operation.

So what I am saying is that there are many varied reasons why some of our friends went down, but there was one reason common to all of them, and that was that they were badly outspent by their opponents. I would direct your attention to your kit, to this rather thick folder "Contributions to Right-Wing Republicans," and there it is spelled out. Now, these totals on the right-hand side are only part of the picture. These figures only give you the contributions of corporate political-action committees, trade associations, and right-wing political organizations. These figures do not include individual contributions solicited by a Viguerie or some other promoter.

A Helms in North Carolina -- 7 million dollars is what he raised. We have 5.2 million listed. John Ingram who opposed him -- $300,000 is what he raised. He decided he didn't want to take any financial contributions from labor. He did accept our support. By the way, don't let anybody tell you the south is a bastion of right-wing conservatism. Here is Ingram with $300,000 against $7 million. He never had the support of a single newspaper and yet he only lost 54-46 percent. He got 46 percent of the vote with a lousy $300,000 budget. Thurmond in South Carolina -- you can see $1,500,000 from corporate, trade and right-wing organizations. He had close to $3,000,000 and Ravenel had about $800,000. Yet, he got 44 percent of the vote against Thurmond. Tower in Texas raised over $4,000,000 and while Krueger had something on the order of $1,500,000, he wasn't exactly an ideal candidate from our standpoint. He didn't vote with us on labor law reform in the House. He did get money from some of the oil companies. He tried to play both sides, but here is Tower with every newspaper of any consequence in Texas. Out of several million votes cast, he only won by some 14,000 votes -- less than one percent. Warner, here in Virginia -- if you watched the campaign, you'd wonder who was running, Mr. Warner or Mrs. Warner, but in spite of the most inept political campaign of the election by Miller, who was running away from us and from the Black community, and from Henry Howell, just was an awful candidate -- he was just accepted by labor in Virginia as the lesser of two evils and he, you see, was outspent and came within a hair's breadth of beating Warner.

But this is the history and when you get a chance, look at these figures. It shows you what we are up against. One of the disturbing signs in the last election is that the AMA and the Corporate Political Committees and the trade associations that used to make limited contributions to out-and-out reactionaries in both parties, now are very clever and this time they contributed money to some COPE endorsed candidates who they felt were sufficiently weak that they might be able to influence them. We have a list of some and the classic example, is Congressman Luken from Cincinnati. We had real trouble in getting him to vote with us on labor law reform. He got more money from corporate and trade association committees than he got from us, and we were very much worried as to how he is going to vote.

Well, that's the picture -- $50,000,000 the FEC reports show were raised by some 800 corporate trade and right-wing political action committees. The Campaign Financing Act of 1974 gives unions the right to go to its members and ask them to sign individual authorization cards revocable at will, asking the employer to deduct "x" amount of money from their pay and turn the money over to the unions' political committee. It gives the employer the same right to set up committees to solicit stock-holders and solicit executives. The unfortunate truth is that they have done a better job than we have -- $50,000,000 is what they raised and contributed in 1978.

The AFL-CIO unions raised some $12,000,000. The Auto Workers and the Teamsters, NEA, some $2,500,000 - $14,500,000 all totaled. We estimate in COPE that in 1980 there will be an explosion on the corporate side. We estimate they have some 800 corporate political committees and will go well over 1,000, and you hear all kinds of estimates as to what they are going to raise in a Presidential year, 1980. The most conservative is $75,000,000 and there are estimates going over $100,000,000. That is what we're up against.

Now, there is no reason for us to believe that if we continue the present tin-cup method of raising political funds that we are going to do any better than we did in 1978. The AFL-CIO seems to have reached a plateau around $12,000,000. Thanks to the FEC reports, for the first time we got a detailed picture of what the international unions have done politically. I regret to say many of them wouldn't even tell us how much they raised and what they did with it, but out of the 100 odd AFL-CIO unions, the record shows that only 36 made extensive contributions to COPE-endorsed candidates. A majority of the unions did not make any contributions to COPE-endorsed candidates. Of the 36, only 9 international unions made $5,000 contributions. Only 6 made $10,000 maximum contributions to a federal candidate, five in the primary and in the general, that the law permits. Now we are convinced in the national COPE that instead of 6 international unions giving the maximum $10,000, if there were 26 that gave, if a Miller and McIntyre who lost by 4,000 votes had say $50,000 more, they could have won.

I believe if McIntyre were not so over-confident, if he had the money to use Boston TV in the closing 2 weeks, it could of made the difference. It could of made the difference in Virginia. It could of made the difference in Iowa with Dick Clark, with Krueger in Texas, with Roy in Kansas; I don't know about Haskell in Colorado and I believe we were so far gone in Minnesota that nothing could have saved us. I do believe that for want of sufficient international unions to come up with the maximum legal contributions, we lost some of our proven friends.

Now it isn't because the international unions did not want to make contributions. They just didn't have the money. They didn't have the money -- it is as simple as all that. Now we have wrestled with all this in COPE and it now brings me to the subject at hand - the checkoff.

We are convinced there is no other way of raising political money in meaningful amounts than the checkoff. I went through the early days of the textile workers organizing committee and I know what it is to raise dues without a checkoff. I know some of our fellow trade unionists in England and elsewhere look askance at the checkoff and theoretically it's much better to have our members so committed to our program that they will pay voluntarily. But you know that isn't the reality. And it is the same way with political contributions. The checkoff is the way to go.

Now, the Executive Council, recognizing this, in its February meeting passed a Resolution making the checkoff not a COPE program but an AFL-CIO program with the entire machinery of the AFL-CIO being put behind it. President Meany has appointed a committee of the Executive Council -- Jay Turner of the Engineers, Lloyd McBride of the Steelworkers, Charlie Pillard of the Electricians, Chick Chaikin of the ILG and Bill Wynn of the Retail Clerks. That committee is going to hold its first meeting on April 2. We have a big job to do. We have a good start on the international level. We neglected to put in the kit, but we will distribute them this afternoon or tomorrow -- a list of international unions that have adopted national programs, and it is an impressive list. It includes some of the largest AFL-CIO unions - the Machinists, the Steelworkers, the Operating Engineers, the Retail Clerks, the Meatcutters, the Teachers -- there must be 25 or 30 representing over half of the membership of the AFL-CIO. They have adopted various programs leaving it pretty much to the local unions. The Steelworkers have adopted a 2 cents a day working day, 10 cents a week. Sheet Metal and Operating Engineers have adopted a 2 cents an hour, 80 cents a week. The Machinists have a local option, a local union option, of 50 cents a month or $1.00 a month. The clerks, the teachers, a dollar a month. But the big bottleneck seems to be on the local union level. It's one thing to have the international union recommend to the local unions that they adopt a checkoff program. But it's apparently another problem to get the local leaders for whatever reasons. Then the more difficult job of going to the individual member and selling the member on signing the authorization card.

Now, what is out goal? Our goal is to raise enough money to have the international unions raise enough money, for not a single penny of this money is earmarked for national COPE. When I outlined this program to President Meany he said, "Where do we fit into this program?" and I told him that I have no doubt that if the international unions raised enough money that there is no question about them meeting their quota to national COPE and I would be comfortable in taking that chance without any of the money being earmarked to national COPE. Our goal is to get the political committees of each international union to raise enough money to maximize their contributions to COPE-endorsed candidates far beyond the 1978 experience. I don't hope in any way to approach the amount of money that the corporations and the right wing will raise. My goal is just to try to approach, make it more balanced -- not $7,000,000 for Helms and $300,000 for his opposition. That is one goal.

Then the other goal I would like to see is enough money raised so

96

that international unions will expand their educational, political educational programs. I mentioned particularly Dick Clark and the one issue appeal. These were a factor in all the states, not just Iowa. I had breakfast with Jimmy Wolfe and we talked about the Ohio gubernatorial where we had an excellent gubernatorial candidate. Well, we just got murdered by the Right-to-Lifers. The Right-to-Lifers already have a hit-list. They have announced it -- Church of Idaho, Culver, McGovern, Birch, Bayh ... I have no doubt that the gun control people, the Prop 13 people, they will all be out, and there is no question in my mind that a certain number of our members will be stolen from us. The Dick Clark experience teaches me that it's not enough to tell our members that Dick Clark had a 100 percent COPE voting record. Dick Clark stood by you, you ought to stick by Dick Clark. That kind of appeal was not enough. Some of our members were peeled off by one or another of these one-issue appeals. What the answer is -- how can we insulate our people in 1980 and the years to come against these demogogue's appeals, phony issues like Prop 13, that is something we have to wrestle with. It is an area where you educators can make a contribution. But, I would like to see enough money raised so that each international union will hire sufficient staff, get out materials, hold educational conferences of all kinds, and hopefully, hopefully insulate the union's membership against the inevitable demogogue appeals that are going to be made by the Reagan's, the Connally's, the Crane's, the you name its. So, that's the story. I believe the checkoff is the way to go. I believe the very existence of the trade union movement as an institution is at stake. When you get the NAM, as it did some months ago, holding a press conference to announce the formation of a Council for a Union Free Environment and in response to a question as to whether this was a union-busting proposition the spokesman for the NAM says, "No, we just believe there is no need for a third party to come between an employer and an employee." Now this is the NAM, this isn't the Chamber of Commerce representing some mainstreet gas station, mom and pop store. This is the NAM and I don't discount lightly the significance of this program of the NAM, especially when you combine it with the assault on public employees -- when in California the Chamber of Commerce just fell short by a hair's breadth of having enough signatures to put on the ballot in California a proposition that would have outlawed collective bargaining for public employees. Jack Henning tells if it ever got on the ballot it would have passed.

When you combine the NAM, the attack on the public employees, the national right-to-work committee assaults all over, including the one that to me is the most ominous of all, much more serious than right to work, and I refer to right-to-work's program of trying to strip the use of union dues. We forget that we're appealing a decision in a Railway Clerks case in San Diego where a District court judge said to the Railway Clerks, "you cannot spend your union dues on anything other than contract negotiations and grievances. Any other expenditure would be illegal." It's on appeal. We in the AFL-CIO think this is so ominous that we have joined with the Railway Clerks, and I break out in a cold sweat thinking what this Nixon-Ford Supreme Court will do in a year or two when it ultimately reaches that court. The labor movement as we know it could not survive with that kind of a straightjacket. A meeting such as this could not be held under that decision. A union newspaper or an educational conference, you name it. They are reaching for our jugular vein. Alan Kistler can tell you the success that these unionbusting political consultants have had that are specializing in advising employers on how to get rid of a union or how to stop a union that is knocking at its door and the NLRB figures show that they are successful. Somehow, someway we have to convince our members that all of this adds up to a threat to the very existence of the trade union movement as an institution. I believe if a Reagan, if a Crane, if a Connally captures the White House; I believe if we lose control of the Senate as is a real possibility -- I say to you in that sorrowful political eventuality the labor movement as an institution in my judgement will be threatened. I see the union-haters reverting back to the pre-Wagner Act 1935 policies of big-business in this country whereas you know they openly opposed the very existence of collective bargaining. Somehow or other we have to get this message to our members. It is more difficult than when there is a right-to-work fight in their states under noses. But the experience in right-to-work fights teaches me that our members are not stupid. They understood in Missouri, and our people were not diverted by these one-issue appeals. They were solid. When they felt that the union as an institution was threatened they stood firm. Our allies elsewhere, in the churches, the Catholic hierarchy spoke out, the Protestant community, the Jewish leaders spoke out, they recognized this as a threat to the trade union movement as an institution. Our friends in the Black community and the Hispanic community responded and I believe that if we go to our members with this story, I am not suggesting that we ignore the traditional political appeals that we make to our members -- full employment, labor law reform, national health insurance, occupational safety -- I'm not suggesting that, I am suggesting the experience in right-to-work states, the threat to the institution is the best appeal that we have to our members in insulating them against the appeals of the one-issue opponents. So, that's the story. I am here really to ask for your help. You can play an important role. The job is primarily an educational job. We are looking for answers, solutions, methods, etc. We have set up a special committee of the COPE Operating Committee to come up with new programs, new approaches. I just cite these to you that we are groping for answers and you can help us with those answers, and so I want to thank you for being patient and listening. Thank you very much.

Robert Schrank,
The Ford Foundation

Humanization of the Workplace

Ten Thousand Working Days came to be written as a result of spending time with academics concerned about the quality of worklife. In our conversations regarding what goes on at work, I never felt a sense of what life is about at work or how people create a community. It is not a question to understand, it rather needs to be experienced. It is somewhat like music. If you have never listened to it then, to say the least, it will be hard to explain what it sounds like. Many workplaces are like that. They need to be experienced to be understood.

Each person's frame of reference, their experiencing bank, is the prism through which they see and perceive. If a workplace is observed with no familiarity or no at-home feeling it will be difficult to make any judgments comparative or otherwise about what is going on.

Workers tend to be quick to resent academics who say, "We are going to help you humanize the workplace." I believe Jack Barbash's response would be something like, "What do you think unions have been doing for the last 50 years? Workers do not need sociologists or industrial psychologists to tell them how to do that." That kind of an interchange closes off most communication. I have tried to understand that as a phenomena of a person's frame of reference or how we perceive what is happening in a workplace.

It was in response to this notion of frame of reference that we developed a program at the Ford Foundation called a "workers exchange." Teams of American workers went to Europe to actually work in an experimental work place. The objective was to have workers from traditionally organized workplaces experience new ways of doing the work. In Sweden at the Saab plant the autonomous work group was supposed to be a better way to assemble a car engine. A cross-section of UAW members from Detroit went to Sweden to spend a month working at Saab. A journalist went along with them to record what they thought of this new work arrangement. We wanted them to look at the autonomous work group through their own frame of reference. The same thing was done with nurses, longshoremen and police. An exchange of seamen on a Norwegian ship was recently completed. It has been a good experience. What we learned in four or six weeks from these exchanges could not have been gleaned from a traditional research model.

For instance, the nature of authority in Sweden. Being an Ingmar Bergman fan I have often wondered as I watched his movies what is the matter with Swedes. Here is the greatest welfare state with one of the highest suicide rates. After traveling in Sweden some years ago on leaving I suggested to one of their labor economists that unlike Marx's notion that revolution would occur when capitalism was unable to respond to the demands of the working class in Sweden, it will occur out of boredom. The boredom grows out of the government's inability to give its citizens an opportunity to want anything. The government's efficient sensing system picks up any universal desires, then grants them. This takes away all the damn fun from demanding and winning. The satisfaction of winning comes from the conflicts, the effort. If that is taken away from people we leave them nothing to want. Big brother ends up doing it for you which is not good for the ego or the psyche so I would prefer for us to do things for ourselves.

One of the Detroit UAW members, a Chicano, after a week at Saab through his frame of reference observes that it is not like Detroit. "Here you do not know who the foreman is though you know he is there. In Detroit you know who the Son of A Bitch is and you keep an eye on him. Now, I prefer Detroit where I know I am being watched and I can deal with that. If I don't know who is watching me then I am dealing with a phantom. I prefer the real thing."

I found this a remarkable piece of insight. Here is an auto worker describing the nature of shop floor conflict and its constructive uses. The uses of conflict on the shop floor as a way to deal with the boredom from the work. I have learned from workers that most work tasks done repetitively become quite trivial and meaningless. Job enrichment suggests that the tasks be increased or the reversal of fragmentation. If the same repetitive task is done over and over and it is enriched to twenty repetitive tasks does that make it more interesting? Enriching jobs to increase the challenge or interest is a very individual experience. My observation is that people have ways of enriching their work places. We need to observe what workers do on their own. On a steam iron assembly line some manager had the idea of enriching work by letting the women assemble and test the whole iron. The women had not been consulted as to if they wanted to do this. In a short time the union had a grievance on their hands from the women who said they did not care that much about steam irons to want to assemble the whole thing. What they liked about the old assembly line was they did not have to think. As a result, they could converse, argue, talk about last night's television, the bowling league, the kids or in a word, to schmooze.

What is happening in the workplace? I will generalize. Looking at the big picture I find workplaces quite different from the ones I grew up in. The change is in the nature of the work. With the exception of some parts of the south, I believe the industrial revolution in the United States is over.

In the era of the industrial revolution the class struggle was clear. The bosses were evil and the workers were good. It was cowboys and Indians and life was simple. Them against us. We are now living in the post-industrial era and that is our problem. Because of evolutionary lag, we live in two eras, yet we are in the post-industrial one. I argue that the trade unionism that came into being in the industrial era is having serious problems in the post-industrialism. Post-industrial service workers do not experience conflict between us and them in the old cowboys and Indian tradition. It is just not there anymore. Many workers who now wear white collars are the sons and daughters of blue collar workers. It is a universal desire amongst blue collar workers that their children not work in the factory. Universally I have heard workers say, "My kids are going to go to school and learn something so they don't have to work here." It may seem strange that workers who in survey research say they are satisfied with their jobs also say, "I don't want my son or daughter to work here." How come the difference? The latter is a real response while the former is a formal account. It is what a person is supposed to say as against what they feel. Most of the stuff of formal accounts can be dismissed as irrelevant.

That shift to the post-industrial revolution has changed the nature of work in a basic way. Work is now becoming increasingly abstract. Employees working in offices, corporate headquarters, white collar jobs, service institutions, communications systems are not producing anything tangible as in manufacture. They are producing information, knowledge or a service. What is information or knowledge? Let me try to describe it for you this way. What are the 50 or 75 of us doing here at this seminar? If I invited some old machinist friends here to observe what they thought was going on here, I believe they would say, "A lot of bull-shit." And I would reply "But this is our work." Conferences, seminars, meetings have become a form of work in post-industrialism, called communication.

How is its productivity measured? Not very sure. Communication work is tough to measure except probably in advertising. People who do abstract work with numbers, information, systems analysis, insurance claims, hospital work, entertainment, all of which is most difficult to quantify.

This tends to make blue collar workers resentful of the rest of us. They realize that the 38 million of them are still bugged to increase productivity. While few of the 62 million in service industries suffer such pressures. The point is that this is the trend of the future for in 1985 manufacturing will represent somewhere around 20 percent of the total workforce.

This is the sector of the labor market represented by the unions. If unions continue to address themselves to that sector they will be talking to the industrial era. The service or post-industrial workers are the children of blue collar workers who escaped from the factory to the white collar. They do not wish to be reminded of their blue collar origin.

There now exists a full-scale flight from blue collar work. Increased education and a continuing denigration of manual work has raised expectations above the factory gate. Some of us may conceive of offices as white collar factories but I would warn us not to confuse the status of the attache case with that of the tin lunch bucket. The former may still carry lunch but it is a symbol of having made it out of the factory.

The change to post-industrialism makes the quality of worklife issues far more germaine. As people perform abstract work, life at the workplace becomes a more dimensional than wages hours and working conditions. Companies in this new workplace have learned how to relate to workers in a far more human way than was the custom in the old industrialism. In spending time with non-union managers I am surprised at how much they have learned about treating workers decently.

If I have given an accurate account of what is happening to the labor market then the labor movement will need to do some soul searching about their role in this post-industrial world. The issues are not 1938. There are not many dark, satanic mills out there to challenge the new organizers. Factories are not the future. The future is the huge white collar complexes being built across this land where millions of workers sit behind desks moving paper. That is the future.

These white-collar, attache-case carriers are not going to be attracted to the old cowboy-indians style of trade unionism. If the labor movement wants to organize these folks they need to learn a new language.

General Motors and the UAW in Tarrytown, New York, got together to resolve some difficult production problems in manufacturing. Instead of treating the employees like dumb-bells, they decided to enlist their aid in solving the leaky windshield problem. They have had less problems in the plant because the employees feel they are respected. What happened? It was a quality of worklife program based on a Japanese "quality control circle" model. When there is a quality control problem they go to the production people and ask them why doesn't this product work? This is a joint union - company effort, a collective enterprise. It is a threat to the traditional adversarial relationship. The number of grievances in Tarrytown declined dramatically. If unions are seen only in an adversarial relationship there will be real problems with this kind of program. There are people in the labor movement who hold that point of view. One of the characteristics of post-industrialism may be its' lack of confrontation. One reason that unionization has failed in the white collar work places is that the unions talk to white collar workers in a blue collar language. White collar workers may not like tough talk. Some of them ran away from blue collar work because they did not want tough talk. They want to be treated like professional people carrying attache cases.

They may be carrying Alka-Seltzer and a spoon in that attache case but it is not to be exchanged for a tin lunch bucket. It is an expression of the sentiment, "I want to be in the managerial white collar class, not in the factory that my father and mother struggled so hard to help me get out of. Don't push me back into the working class. It was hard enough for me to get out."

Part of the new workplace is more time to schmooze. All employees--people--seem to desire that. It is a universal. We do it in factories, offices, coal mines. We are doing it here today. If you are a knowledgeable worker like an academic your job may be to schmooze.

As we move into this post-industrial world there is a growing need to look at relationships at work. Are they based on the old industrial model or do they represent the new era or relationships. It can be seen as a cultural change at work. Are they based on the old industrial model or do they represent the new era of relationships. It can be seen as a cultural change at work. Add to wages, hours and working conditions, the nature of human relationships at work.

The quality of worklife presents a peculiar contradiction. On the one side there is an issue of how we are going to run places of work in ways that are more fulfilling to human beings and on the other how not to permit that to become a tactic of keeping out the unions.

Patsy Fryman,
Assistant to the President,
Communications Workers
of America

Quality of Work Projects

I want to direct my remarks, to what I consider what is good about quality of worklife committees, worker participation committees, or industrial democracy committees, whatever we care to call it. From my perspective, what I think it means is workers through their unions, are given a chance to participate, in a meaningful way, with management, in making decisions about their jobs in the workplace.

Now, there are certainly obstacles to overcome, which you will be hearing more about from Paul, but I don't consider them to be insurmountable. The reasons I will concentrate on the good aspects is because I sincerely believe that the question is not whether to change work patterns, but rather what kinds of changes are going to take place, and by whom. Said another way, new ways to work are going to happen and in my opinion it is a question of whether organized labor takes the lead, or whether it gets thrust upon us by outside forces, and we resist that change, thus, having less of an opportunity to impact on what happens.

I want to emphasize that my remarks are my own. My union does not have a policy, per se, on quality of worklife. It does have a policy, in a minute sense, of the total umbrella of the quality of worklife and that is on flexible working hours.

We have a bargaining policy which says that CWA will engage in collective bargaining to gain flexible working hours, and that is the floating workday, in those places which it is reasonable and feasible to do so. I also want to emphasize that my concept of quality of working life is not that which is being practiced in the European countries. I believe that the adversary relationship in collective bargaining in this country has worked well and I don't see any reason to change it at this point. My view of worker participation programs is that these programs should occur outside of the collective bargaining arena and not directly impact on the collective bargaining agreements relative to wages, and hours of work. Ideas born from worker participation programs to committees may indeed be part of the bargaining processes in the future.

The workers we represent today are not the same type as those we represented 20 years ago. Certainly they expect adequate wages, job security, shorter work weeks, to name a few. In addition, however, workers are placing more emphasis on dignity at the workplace, self-respect, self-expression, participation in decisions, and the freedom which is theirs as a citizen. Reaction to autocratic rule is being expressed by higher absenteeism, declining product quality and the general revolt of the younger, more educated workforce against oppressive authority. Job stress is a term that is being more widely used and we hear more about it from our workers then ever before. This, of course, can be related to technology, which reduces our workers in many instances to extensions of a computer, tedious, boring, monotonous tasks and lack of security as machines replace workers. At the same time, again directly related to technology, other jobs are becoming more sophisticated and complex. Both cause stress.

I believe worker participation committees could reduce day to day stress that our members are forced to work under. What we have found is that day to day job pressures are not being solved by the grievance procedure, arbitration procedure, or collective bargaining. Worker participation programs at the shop level is where to attack these pressures in my opinion. Some items which I think could be effectively dealt with include: job redesign of monotonous and repetitious tasks, participation in decision making as it relates to too much or too little work, confinement in the work area, a clear definition of the job and its responsibilities, too much supervision, rigid work rules, job satisfaction, opportunity of learning new skills, the cold, heat and noise, paying more attention to the way the job fits the person, providing more independent and innovative approaches to various tasks, changing the style of supervision, creating a comfortable work environment.

Worker participation committees must have a strong support system from the highest levels of a union and employer. They must be well planned and executed or they are doomed to failure to begin with. I view this concept as strengthening the trade union movement, not weakening it. Members would see the union as coequal in designing and implementing the program which directly impacts on the workers lives being improved, having therefore, greater participation and appreciation in their union.

Now, I have heard it said that employers think of their workers as having bodies but no heads at the workplace. From the employer standpoint they hire a worker on a given job then they instruct that worker on how that job is to be performed, what tools are to be used and when, how much they are to do and what product or service their labor will produce. Unions, on the other hand, through a collective bargaining agreement negotiates the way they will be paid, the hours they will work, and an organized procedure if that agreement is violated. As union members and citizens, those same workers participate in decisions that are related to every aspect of their family unit, choose the leaders of this country by exercising their voting privilege, make decisions in the community and its structure, and make decisions in their union as to those leaders, and the services provided to them. In a nutshell, it seems to me that unions and employers should not be glued to that which was applicable 20 years ago. Today's members possess different value systems which dictate change. As unions, let us remember that that worker also has a head.

Paul Rosenstein,
Department of Education
and Leadership Training,
AFSCME

Quality of Work Projects in the Public Sector

I would like to talk about some of the experiences we have had in the public sector. The public sector is, in many ways, very similar to the private sector, but there are a lot of very significant differences. Probably the most important, of course, is that we don't work for a profit-making organization. Theoretically we work for the taxpayers. We actually work for professional managers, and in that sense there are a lot of similarities to experiences in the private sector.

First, I would like to make a couple of personal observations. I was very moved by reading Bob Schrank's book, Ten Thousand Working Days, and I would encourage everybody to read it. For those of you who have had a steady diet of academic works, it might interest you to know that there is not one single regression analysis in the book, and standard deviation isn't mentioned once. It is a very refreshing book. One of the things that struck me are the similarities to some of the experiences that I have had. I have, just by chance, in the last 15-17 years or so, had the opportunity to work in a variety of industries -- from skilled work in the construction and auto industries, to selling shoes to assembly line work in an electronics plant to working in show biz. (I worked in the shipping and receiving department for 20th Century Fox.)

This opportunity to compare different kinds of work and get somewhat of a sense of some of the things going on out there is why I say this book is especially meaningful to me, particularly its discussion of the informal activities that take place on the job. It is something that we do not usually look at. We are very used to the formal things that go on in the workplace. We are used to looking at, as Bob said, formal questionnaires and surveys of worker attitudes. We also look at the workplace in terms of the contract. We define what is right and what is wrong, what goes and what doesn't go, based upon what the agreement allows. We view the union's activities in terms of the formal meetings that take place, For too long we have lost the understanding of the importance of the informal factors. Bob calls it, in his book, "smoozing." We might call it "socialization" -- the discussions that take place over coffee breaks, on the job when it is possible for people to talk, at lunch periods and so on. Now, organizers (you heard something about organizing yesterday) have gotten hold of some of the importance of the informal activity because they will often look at a workplace in terms of who has coffee together, who has lunch together, who rides together, how the workplace is divided up. They will draw maps and so on, in an effort to try to identify people they can organize. Sometimes it is very successful.

Sociologists years ago found out that informal groups tend to produce informal leaders. Organizers will look for the "key" person, and if organized, that person will often get the co-workers to go along and join the union. Workers will tend to have people emerge in their social groupings or cliques who could be called opinion makers, and others will look to them for guidance. These people can be crucial in either helping or hurting an organizing drive. However, one thing that we don't appreciate is how we can build the union (after the organizing drive) in our day-to-day activities. For example, stewards can build a strong and effective union organization if they are aware of the informal networks that exist. Very often they look at their co-workers in an undifferentiated way. They don't appreciate the kind of activity that goes on informally where people really make their decisions of whether they are strongly behind the union or whether they are not too concerned about the union or are hostile to it. If stewards and local officers learn to relate to the informal life on the job and the leadership it creates, we will be able to build much more effective and responsive local unions.

In regard to the quality of work experiments, we are very concerned, as Bob said, with the effects they will have on the union. There are a lot of fears in the labor movement that successful experiments may encourage workers to feel that they don't need unions. One way I look at it, is that it is not the experiment or program itself that is the crucial thing, it is really a question of who initiates it. I would make the analogy of what happens when we get a 50 cent raise. If the boss puts up a notice one day in a workplace and says that starting tomorrow everybody gets a 50 cent per hour raise, then it is quite likely that the employees are going to be thankful to the boss for giving them that increase. That is where their loyalty will lie. And that is who they will go to the next time they are concerned about getting a raise. But, if you take a different situation where the union is present and demands a 50 cent raise and it is refused and the union has to go on strike for three months and they then settle and win that 50 cent raise, then people will go back to work and they will feel that the union was responsible and they themselves were responsible, for winning that 50 cent raise. Their loyalty will then be to the union and hopefully they will have some appreciation of their strength. The end product is the same. In both cases, they get a 50 cent raise, but their loyalty is different.

We can say the same thing for these quality of worklife experiments. If the union is the initiator, and if the workers themselves are the initiators, of many of the changes that can take place to improve their work, then I think the union will benefit by it. Then the union will be seen as an organization that can have an important role to play in improving the day-to-day existence on the job. But, as is all too often the case (and has been our experience in the public sector,) when the change comes from a party on the outside (academia) or comes from management, then the likelihood is that the union will not be seen as the force for improvement, and the loyalty will go to the other side.

Let me just quickly mention a couple of different experiences that we had had around the country. There is a lot of talk about quality of worklife experiments and yet as I began to look around, I was only able to find a few examples. Most of our experiences have been generally on the negative side, but there have been a few positive situations here and there. One of the positive experiences was in Springfield, Ohio. It was with the sanitation workers, and it is still going to some extent. For those of you who follow these experiments, it was not too different from many of the others. Workers were called together and they met with management and initially there was a lot of hostility and a lot of distrust. For example, management had a practice of combatting absenteeism. They would send somebody to visit the homes of workers who didn't show up for work to verify that they were really sick and had a good reason not to come to work. Well, you can imagine when you bring together this kind of management and their employees into the same room to try to discuss improving the quality of worklife, the kind of distrust and suspicion and the kinds of problems you would have. Over a period of time, they got to work some of these problems out, and they learned about why there was this lack of trust, and they made some changes in the way refuse was picked up. They did away with the traditional supervisor. They gave CB radios to the people on the trucks, and they agreed that when all the work was done, people could go home. But all the work had to be done. Instead of people having assigned routes, or in addition to that, they would use the CB radios to help others who had a particularly bad day and were bogged down somewhere. A great deal of cooperation developed and the employees were able to go home when they finished their work. They were able to eliminate one of twelve garbage trucks which were roaming the city as part of that whole experiment. Of course, nobody lost their job. This was a prerequisite to these experiments.

So, there has been a little success there. Drivers began to trade off the work with the people throwing the trash and exchange some of the least desirable parts of the job, and they did other things there too. All of these ideas were initiated by the employees in Springfield, and it had a very positive effect on absenteeism and management stopped the practice of visiting their homes to see if they were sick.

On the other hand, we have had a lot of negative experiences. In Detroit, for example, there was a productivity program, and they had a very complicated formula developed to try and calculate any increases in the productivity of sanitation workers. Productivity is very difficult to measure in the public sector. You can pick up trash faster, but if you leave a mess behind, you are not going to make the public much happier. One of the concerns was in providing efficient public services. They would send inspectors out and they would see how much trash was picked up and how much dirt was left on the street, and how much gasoline was used by the trucks and how many hours it took, and so on and so forth, and in the end the whole thing collapsed. Our people felt they had increased productivity tremendously, but the very complicated formula which nobody but the city could figure out, seemed to dispell that, and as a result of all their efforts, they were not entitled to any of the monetary increases that had been promised. The whole scheme went down the tubes.

AFSCME also had an experience in Urbana, Illinois. I happened by chance to be involved in it when I was working at the University of Illinois in the Labor Education Program a couple of years ago. There a labor-management committee was set up to try to improve the atmosphere in the city. It was initiated by the University (with government support) and by the management, and then sold to the union with the usual guarantees that there would be no layoffs, the contract would not be violated, that any savings would be shared with the employees and so on. So, I was invited to one of the joint meetings, and I was asked to explain the grievance procedure and what a wonderful device it was to deal with their problems. They also had sessions that lasted several days at a time when they poured their hearts out to each other as to why they had these feelings of distrust and mistrust and conflicts.

The work relationships began to improve a bit as they held regular meetings and made some changes in the way the streets were being repaired and cleaned and so on. Then they went through a contract negotiation and were very successful. But, soon after the contract was signed and settled, the city changed the working hours and decided it wanted people to come in an hour earlier to clear the snow for various reasons which were sensible to it. There was a snowstorm that hit a couple of days later, and there was a wildcat strike, union leaders were fired and that very successful honky-dory relationship went up in smoke.

Management is very often willing to consider these experiments and initiate them because they are thinking about increasing productivity and finding ways to try to motivate workers. They realize that the methods they have used in the past are not going to get the work done efficiently, but they are not willing to surrender their power. After all, it is the most threatening thing in the world if a manager has to give up supervisory control over workers. If they don't have the ability to order people around, then someone may ask why they are needed. They can get quite insecure. So, many of these experiments start off on somewhat of a positive tone, and then sooner or later, when the crunch comes, they get sabotaged by management, particularly lower level management, who find themselves unwilling to give up any of the power that they have over their employees.

Everyone knows of the General Food plant which was run by the workers. One of the stories that I have heard from the plant manager was that they had told the workers, convinced the workers, that they were running that plant. It was like an island of socialism. It was a very idealistic situation. Just one of the things no one mentions was that the workers hired and fired -- one of the most radical departures from general traditions that you can imagine. At any rate, this plant manager was speaking to a group of business people and somebody asked, "These people think they run the plant. Isn't that going to cause any problems? Aren't you nervous about that?" He said, "No, I am not nervous about that. However, you know we have been telling these workers that we have a higher rate of productivity, and we have been making a greater profit each year over what we would ordinarily make from a traditionally run plant, and some of the workers started to say they deserved their share of that money." And he added, "I just, as a matter of fact, put in a proposal to the home office that we should give some of these increased savings to the employees." However, he admitted that "they didn't take it very well when I sent the proposal in." So, a few months later, for that and for many other reasons, the experiment was throttled.

In the public sector we work for the taxpayers. We still have an adversary relationship -- our managers are managers just like anywhere else -- but it is in our interest to see that services are provided in an efficient and effective way. We have tremendous obstacles which are often caused by poor management. One of the vehicles that is commonly used in the public sector is the labor-management committee. The union sits down with management to try to deal with a lot of the problems. Often they are very effective. But it is also quite common to find management people afraid of surrendering their authority.

Let me just conclude with one thought. When you read Bob Schrank's book, you will see that he poses the problem confronting modern society: How can we increase participation in the "affairs of everyday life" in the workplace? One of the keys to significantly and really improving the quality of worklife, he says, is to create a situation where workers themselves play key roles in developing, dreaming up and implementing a lot of the changes that have to be made. I am very much in favor of that. It seems to me that one of our basic problems, and it is not just in the workplace but throughout society, is that we increasingly rely on the running of society by technicians, specialists and experts. As life continues its modern advance and becomes more complex, it moves all of us farther from being able to participate in the decisions that have to be made.

Take our stewards, for example, To what degree do we spend our time training stewards to be Philadelphia lawyers? Many years ago there may have been an emphasis on the stewards being the leaders, the representatives of their co-workers, the union builders, people that brought the union to the members. Today, with our emphasis on training stewards to write and handle grievances, I've often heard them turn away co-workers telling them that they had real problems, but the union couldn't help because the contract language wasn't sufficient. In AFSCME we put a great deal of emphasis on training our stewards to first decide whether a problem is a good problem or not, and then it's their job to figure out how to solve it, how they can use the contract and the grievance procedure. Many of our stewards are intimidated by the pressures to act like lawyers. Their goal should be to build the union and show their people what the union does for them. So it seems to me that the greatest challenge facing us is how we can, in this society that needs specialists to run it, find ways to increase the participation of all of us in the activities that affect our everyday lives.

Ed Garvey, Executive Director,
National Football League
Players Association

The "Unions for Youth" Program

Thank you very much. We are very pleased to be here. I think some of you may have in your mind the question of whether we are really a labor organization. To put any of those thoughts to rest, the NFL Players Association is the first group of athletes to become a certified union and we were certified by the NLRB in 1970. The North American Soccer League Players Association was recently certified the first of September. So, we have the only two organizations in sports representing the athletes as certified unions. We think we are finally getting to the point where maybe the rest of the labor community will invite us to join the family so we can affiliate with the AFL-CIO. Our Executive Committee is going to seek affiliation because we think it is time we get into the labor movement.

I spoke at our Soccer Player Rep meeting yesterday in Chicago and I told them that I am one of the world's greatest experts in America on how to lose a strike! If they need any advice on how to do it I can give it to them because we have done that in football successfully now every time we go up against the NFL owners. I understand you have been hearing messages about the right wing and its efforts in this country to control things. If you want to study the problems of our society in microcosm, I would invite you to take a long hard look at the monopolists who call themselves "sports owners" and see how they operate, because I think they have the same techniques and the same attitudes that you confront in day to day life as you try to achieve dignity for the workers you represent.

We are pleased to be here for a number of reasons, one of them is because we hope that we can get your support as we progress with a program that we think has tremendous potential. It is a program that we have maybe somewhat pretentiously called "Unions for Youth" but it is our thought that we can develop a program for young people in this country working with labor unions throughout the United States and the professional athletes to help economically deprived young people with a chance in life by exposing them to various vocations that are available to them.

The concept started a year or so ago when we met down in Bal Harbour with some of the major unions and suggested to them that if we could get the financial support of the international unions we would have professional athletes as counselors in the camps working with young people because it has been our experience that the professional athlete has access and credibility with young people like few other people [illegible] our society. If Brigg Owens or Alan Page walks into a group and talks [illegible] them they will listen. We think there is always that problem, of course, that too many young people see the professional athlete and think that is a way out of the ghetto and they think that is the way to go. One of our primary goals is to make sure that by using the professional athletes that these young people get the idea that that is not the way to succeed because only one out of 1,000 or 2,000 has any chance whatsoever of making it in professional sports and even those who do make it will find that at the end of a very short career the career opportunities will not be nearly what they thought they would be in the first place. If they happen to be Black they will find they will not get coaching jobs or front office jobs in the National Football League and won't have very many job offers in baseball or the other sports. So we think that it is important that the professional athlete, while serving as a role model and talking to them about the career opportunities, also disabuse these young people of the thought that by dribbling the basketball a little more or working out on the football field that somehow or other that is going to take care of their opportunities in life.

Well, we found out something that we are going to throw out to you and that is that it is hard to raise money from the International Unions. I am sure that all of you have had a different experience and it is just a question that we are not affiliated and I am sure that if we become affiliated the money will flow at such a pace that we are going to have to have special accountants just to keep track of it.

We were encouraged when George Meany sent a personal check for $250 because we thought that was the beginning but it turns out that was about the end. So we had an opportunity to meet with Bob Taggart over at the Office of Youth Affairs at the Department of Labor and he suggested that it was unlikely that we would get in the neighborhood of $1,000,000 from the Internationals and that possibly the Department of Labor could be of assistance. So we applied for and received a grant this year. We have over one million dollars from the Department of Labor and Community Services Administration.

We will get about $1,200,000 for this year for five camps to be held this summer. The five cities will be the Bay area, Cleveland, Chicago, Boston and here in Washington (actually it is in Culpeper, Virginia). The whole purpose of this program is not just to bring in economically deprived young people to participate in athletics. We will be using women track stars and women basketball players as well as professional football players and soccer players to work with them in clinics and working in sports. But these will not be sports camps. The main purpose will be to work with counselors in each community, working with labor unions in these communities to get these young people to think about their future careers and what they are going to do after high school or if they drop out what they are going to do at that point. And so we will be talking about everything from the Job Corps program to other vocational openings that we see as possibilities. Our hope is that by the example of the professional athletes and the union people that we will involve in these communities that we can have a positive impact to the extent that we will then be able to convince a number of other people to contribute to the program and expand it to every city where there is an NFL franchise. If so, instead of 4,000 young people who will be in the program that we can look forward to having as many as 25,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 young people in the summer months working in the Unions for Youth program. We see it as a way not only to help young people who are involved, but to say to the communities that organized labor is concerned about the problems of youth in this country and that we are reaching out to do something about these problems. And that is why we haven't gone to Pepsi Cola or to Avon or other corporations to get the money. We have come to organized labor and said let's do this project together so that we can have a positive program within the community so that people can identify with labor.

The second element is a message to young people that if they have a need for friends in life, and they do, they should turn to organized labor. These are the people who are working men and women in this country. These are the people who fight for all the progressive reforms in this country. These are the people who are going to help them when they need it most. We see the Junior Chamber of Commerce and we see what they do and we see all these other programs in the community; and we don't see enough of the unions being involved and we think this will be a message to those young people that if the professional athletes are involved in organized labor and are willing to spend their time working with them in the summer camp program, and if we involve the union people in each community, that this will be an important lesson for them to understand where their friends really are.

So, that's the concept and we are going to try to raise $125,000 from organized labor. Last year the American Federation of Teachers contributed

$5,000 plus a lot of valuable staff time. The Machinist union contributed $10,000. The Auto Workers contributed about $1,500. There were a number of other unions that did contribute. We have learned our lesson on about how "easy" it is to raise money in this country. Walt suggested that I contact Richard Viguerie but we were sure this was not quite along the lines that he had in mind with his direct mailing campaign and Jessie Helms has thus far withheld his endorsement of the program!

We are hoping that some of you are wondering if there is something you can do to help us out with this program. We need your ideas and your help in the camp program itself and working with these youngsters toward developing career opportunities.

Val Lorwin
and
Roberta Till-Retz
University of Oregon

Women and Trade Unions in Four European Countries

Val Lorwin

Roberta Till-Retz and I are happy to be here to report to you on the study that we and Alice Cook have been making on women's participation in trade unions and in the unions' activities on women's issues in four European countries. Our study focuses on good practices in the unions of Germany, Austria, Great Britain and Sweden. We conceived the study because of the lack of serious reporting on the problems of women in the trade unions. We thought that reporting on work in Europe could be a further stimulus to the action already going on in the United States and the exchange of experiences among American union people and between them and European unionists. We consulted a number of trade union women, officers and staffers and labor educators, and a few men, in Washington and in New York. It is good to see many of them in this audience today. They told us how they might use ideas and information from Europe in their own work on equality in this country. The focus on good practice seemed to us and to our advisers to provide the best possibilities of utilizing European experiences for American consideration and American needs.

Good practice in what? On four of our major topics we shall give you a few of our findings; for other topics, there won't be time. Roberta will talk first on the adaptation of union structures and processes to make possible greater participation by women, and then on education and training of women for leadership. I shall talk about women's roles in collective bargaining, some experiences in bargaining for equal pay and equal opportunity, and about health and safety work and training.

In "our" countries (to use shorthand for the four countries that we studied) industrial and occupational structures are quite similar to ours. The proportions of women in the labor force and the proportions of working mothers with small children are more or less similar to ours; in Germany they are somewhat lower than ours; in Sweden, higher. In all these countries a great many women work part time and, as elsewhere, that is a source of great exploitation, and a challenge to the unions.

The most striking difference is in rates of union organization. European unions organize a much higher percentage of employees, manual and white collar, men and women, than we do in the United States. The rate of unionization for both sexes in Germany is about 40 percent; Britain, over 50 percent; Austria, about 67 percent, and in Sweden, 90 percent. As for women, in comparison to about one out of six employed women who are in unions and bargaining associations in this country, the number is about 1 out of 5 in Germany, almost 1 out of 3 in Britain, almost 1 out of 2 in Austria, and 3 out of 4 in Sweden. Take the most difficult case--the organization of part timers--almost all of whom, as you know, are women. The Swedes told us, "We've been able to organize only 51 percent of our part timers." ("Only 51 percent" -- we should have such problems).

Roberta Till-Retz

Union Structures

Unions have finally ceased overt discrimination against women. But the pervasive effects of discrimination against women in the society at-large--in family life, socialization, education, vocational training, and employment--have frustrated the hopes that formal equality would mean real equality for women in the labor movement. More and more women and men are asking whether it is necessary now to develop special structures and processes to help women get over the threshold of union participation.

In Europe we found many unions experimenting with such means to facilitate women's participation. They are experimenting with more convenient times and places for union meetings, with child care at union schools, conventions, and meetings, with education programs directed at women, and with special union structures, all in the effort to make union activism easier for women.

The most important special structures are women's divisions within unions and confederations. Women's divisions exist in several major American unions. In Germany and Austria, these women's divisions have existed since the Second World War. They are built into the union structure from the confederation through the national (that is, our international) level, to the state level and in some cases to the local level. They have resources and outreach greater than the divisions in American unions.

What is a women's division? In its most fully developed form, in Germany and Austria, it consists of a series of committees of women activists, lay people--that is, volunteers, not officers or staff--on levels from the national down to the local. The activities of these committees are coordinated by one or more staff people at the national level and sometimes at the regional level. The work of the committees and of the staff people is integrated with the rest of the union structure in many ways: for example, ex officio seats on the executive bodies for the heads of the women's divisions at various levels.

The first and most basic function of a women's division is the collection of information on women in the union's jurisdiction, women members of the unions, and women's conditions. That information must then be made known to women workers, to both men and women members of the union, and to the male leaders of the union. Such information has aroused women to union activism, and has made an impression on men in many unions. The staff coordinator of one women's division told us this: "Trying to move this union on women's issues is like trying to move a mountain. But when I get most discouraged, I realize that if all I could do was collect and spread the information on our women members, on their obviously low wages, on their crowding into low skill areas, on their terrible underrepresentation in union offices at all levels, if all I did was collect this information and feed it back to the women, my work would be significant. Women today start to get active when they read or hear this information. They, not my staff or I, are the ones who are going to move this union."

A striking example of the effects of such dissemination of information can be seen in the work of the women's division of one Austrian union. The women's committees of this union divided up in teams, each team studying one aspect of union life or collective bargaining, and of women's participation in that activity. The result was a booklet distilling all of their findings; most of them reflected strong patterns of discrimination within the union.

The booklet was published, not by the women's division itself, but by the union as a whole. It was presented to the public in a dramatic way. The President of the union frankly told a national press conference that his union was guilty of massive, but unintentional, discrimination against women. He pledged the whole leadership of his union, which is Austria's largest union, to a campaign to wipe out that discrimination in the union and eventually in society at large.

This booklet has had a continuing impact on opinion within the union. It has been used everywhere by women's committees to educate trade union women. It has galvanized rank and file women to keep up the pressure for equality.

What else do women's divisions do? They lobby, and get many women to lobby, within their unions and in some cases outside their unions (with legislators, for example) on family policy issues--for child care provisions, more extensive social security protection for women, and so on. We saw women's divisions helping create experimental vocational training, in cooperation with labor market boards, for schoolgirls to learn non-traditional trades. We saw them sponsoring research into ways of lessening sex segregation on the labor market. In Austria we saw one women's division--in a production workers' union--setting up teams of women to survey their union's collective agreements to ferret out all clauses that discriminated against women. Then they could go to their bargaining committee with specific requests for removal of those clauses, whose discriminatory nature the men might not have noticed. Everywhere we saw women's divisions seeking out women and helping them acquire the information, skills and confidence to qualify for workplace and union office.

Let us look at a women's division in a British union that organizes white-collar employees in the metal trades. "TASS" is the Technical, Administrative, and Supervisory Section of one of the big manual workers' unions, the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers. One of the most striking successes of the women's division in TASS has been its recruitment of new members.

Between 1967 and 1977, women's membership rose from 2,500 which was 3 percent of the total union membership, to 27,000, which was 17 percent of an increased membership. In the two years between 1975 and 1977, women's membership in TASS doubled.

The TASS Women's Division has used rank-and-file women to organize other women around the issue of equal pay. It has used the slogan of "Men's Pay for Women," and with men's support. The Division has roused the enthusiasm of women at the local level to go out and spread the good word about the union on their own. Meanwhile, it has mobilized the resources of the head office for intensive, targeted recruitment drives at workplaces. An important part in recruiting has been the flow of information from the regional women's committees to the national committee and back. The regional committees report regularly on recruitment activities and prospects. They regularly send information on which firms have just been organized in their areas, which grades of employees have been recruited, what provisions for women have been included in recent contracts, and how women's salaries compare with men's.

Once the firms are targeted for organizing efforts, the national women's officer provides local activists with equipment and organizing materials keyed to the needs of that local situation, always emphasizing the women's angle. Of course, TASS women also recruit as many men as they can, while focusing on women.

TASS was once regarded, with justification, as a union mainly of and for higher-skilled male draftsmen. At the local level, TASS women have conducted research in the history of women in their union that has helped them feel more at home in their own union. For this research has shown how women have participated in the historic struggles of the union, defeats and victories. Published in the union's journal, this interesting research has shown both women and men how women have helped to build the union.

The TASS self-image and even its national image are now changing, TASS--although a small union--is being recognized as a leader in the struggle for women's equality.

Substantial training programs aimed to preparing for union activism have begun to pay off, with increasing numbers of women in union offices. The national union convention in 1975 found women in the same proportions among delegates to the convention as in the membership as a whole: that is a rare achievement.

Union women abroad are no more naive about their lack of power than they are here. Power, many women argue, can come only through the presence of women on executive bodies and bargaining committees. But, some are tired of waiting for women to move up from the ranks in nominally free competition with men. Many union women are, albeit with reluctance, coming around to talk about quotas for women in union offices. This is a controversial subject almost everywhere.

One British union, with two-thirds of its members women and no woman in national union office in 1975 reserved five out of 25 seats on its national Executive Council (and two out of 16 seats on each regional executive) for women. That is the National Union of Public Employees (NUPE). It organizes manual workers in the public sector: school cooks and those who serve school meals, cleaning women, hospital workers, ambulance drivers, sanitation workers, and so on.

Union leaders and activists in NUPE wanted to find a form of affirmative action for women that would not discriminate against men. They added 5 seats to the national Executive Council of 20, so that none of the existing seats would be taken from men who occupied them. Union leaders hoped that the five newly added women Executive Council members would create a "bridgehead" within the union from which women could make more rapid advances on their own. (NUPE has no other special structures, or any other kind of preference, for women.)

The union hopes that after a period of years (or decades)--time still unspecified--reserved seats will no longer be needed. The holders of reserved seats at national and regional levels are elected by members of both sexes. They should serve as role models for rank-and-file women, and help give them the courage to seek union office. They should add a previously lacking perspective to the union's decision-making process and to its policies.

We talked with the five women elected to the Executive Council in 1975. One other woman was at the same time elected to a non-reserved seat. All the five elected to reserved seats were excellent, tough, wonderful women. None of them was entirely comfortable in her reserved seat; all would have preferred to have won their seats in competition with men. But they all agreed that they never could have made it yet on their own. Not that they were not good enough, they said, but because of the male sexism in their union, and the social conditions that made it so hard for a woman to devote herself to union work as fully as a man may do.

Four years after NUPE's innovation, it is still too soon to say whether the reserved seats have achieved their purpose. There are some good signs. Many more women have been elected shop stewards. Many more women are taking training courses. More women were delegates to the 1977 Convention than at any previous convention. The image of NUPE, in the eyes of its members--male and female--and of its potential members, has changed in the last few years. Of course, it is hard to say how much of these developments are due to the reserved seats.

The NUPE experiment has been watched by women and men in other British unions. There is a lot of talk about some kinds of quotas: at union conventions, on stewards' councils, and maybe on bargaining committees. The talk is coming, not only from young feminists entering the union movement, but from older women who have worked in the movement for years. Some older women who, five years ago, would not even have listened to talk of quotas, are now themselves asking whether quotas are necessary. So also are some Swedish women, in a union movement that early in the 1970s abolished its women's divisions as contrary to the principle of equality.

Union Education

Women's participation in unions must be encouraged and eased through increased training of women through union education programs. As Barbara Wertheimer has said, workers' education is the "talent scout" of the labor movement as well as its training arm. This has long been true for men and it can be increasingly true for women. Education departments are not power centers within the unions, but they can facilitate the recognition of women in unions. Some European unions are modifying their programs to meet the special problems that women face. Furthermore, some of the changes that open education programs more fully to women also open them more to disadvantaged male workers, for example, single fathers, members of ethnic minorities, and men who do not have enough free time, information about the union, or basic communication skills.

Here, in summary listing, are some of the changes in education programs in Europe that have made them more accessible to women:

Decentralizing to the local level courses that were previously given in residential schools.

Breaking up long courses into shorter segments, each self-contained.

Adding specific courses to build confidence and even courses frankly seeking to raise feminist consciousness.

Courses for women only, and courses on women's problems,

Integrating traditional correspondence courses with television and group study.

Providing child care at residential schools, or child care allowances for parents attending the schools.

One European development that has great potential importance for women, as for men, is paid released time for union training. Women who cannot get away from home for training, even for a few hours on weekends, can attend day release courses held during working hours at or near the workplace.

Educational leave with pay is on the way to becoming "a new right for labor" in Europe. It is being achieved through legislation or bargaining or a combination of the two. Under strong union pressure, many European governments--and employers too--are recognizing the need to train union representatives to handle the increasingly significant and complex functions of collective bargaining, health and safety programs, and pension funds. In the early 1970s, Germany and Austria passed laws requiring employer-paid released time for training members of work councils, institutions that are roughly similar to our stewards' councils.

Even where the right to paid educational leave is recognized by law or contract, workers are unlikely to claim this leave, and claim it successfully, unless unions actively promote its use. If this is true for men, how much more true for women with their usually less assertive attitude to supervisors or employers.

The women's divisions of German and Austrian unions have made special efforts to get women to stand for election to work councils so that they will be eligible for training on employer-paid time. Where necessary, they then support the women works councellors' claims for training time when they can best use it.

Many women have an "educational deficit" compared to most men, often even in general education as well as--most often--in vocational training and in union experience. In Sweden, unions and government have made the greatest and the most systematic efforts to involve passive or disadvantaged workers--including immigrants and those on shift work or other "anti-social hours" -- in workers education. Government has paid trade unionists - both manual and white-collar employees - to train themselves for such "outreach" work, and those who have this training are entitled to use company time to reach as many as possible at their workplaces. The women who most need further education can often be reached only by such special efforts. Sweden and its labor movement have found that it is worth making those efforts.

Val Lorwin

Collective Bargaining

A number of the unions that we studied have seen the importance of having women in collective bargaining functions. There is evidence that large numbers of men and women will vote for women as their bargaining representatives, and that women are ready to take up these functions, especially at local levels, and to take training for the more effective representation of their fellow workers. The best evidence on this point comes from the works councils in Germany and Austria.

Works councils act in many ways like shop stewards' councils, but they are not an arm of the union; they derive their powers not from collective agreements, but from the law. In Germany and Austria the law requires their election, among white collar as well as production employees, in all but very small establishments. They are elected by the vote of all the employees, organized or unorganized, but the unions put up slates of candidates and most of the councillors are also union activists. So, there is a form of coordination with union policies.

The works council does the plant-level bargaining. Collective agreements in Germany are reached chiefly on a regional industry-wide basis, for example, the metal working industry of North Rhine-Westphalia or the textile industry of Bavaria. But that agreement sets only minimum rates of pay, and the works council then negotiates what improvements it can in wages and salaries and other conditions in its own establishment.

Now to the question of women as works councillors. In 1975, German workers elected about 210,000 works councillors nation-wide. Of these, no less than 30,000 were women--30,000 women carrying out these local bargaining functions throughout Germany. In the next elections, in 1978, the numbers of women elected were even higher, as we know, although so far we have the figures for only four major sectors: Chemicals, Metal-Working Industries, Textiles and Clothing, and Distribution, Banking and Insurance. And in these four sectors alone the number of women elected last year totaled 25,000, so the total must have been well over the 30,000 of 1975.

In all the four countries that we studied there has been a stimulus to local unions to include women on their bargaining committees or on job evaluation teams. The British white-collar union TASS bargains usually on an establishment level. The national office has sent out the word to locals to make sure that women are present in negotiations "both to learn and to affect the outcome."

The General and Municipal Workers Union, one of the big three British manual unions, carries on a great deal of job evaluation. In its special manual on "Bargaining for Equality," it warns its locals of the manifold ways in which employers may try to evade the reality of equal pay for women, which is the law in Britain now. G and M instructs its locals to have women elected or coopted on the union job evaluation team. It says, "Where job evaluation exercises are being carried out involving women's jobs, and where there are no female shop stewards or only a few female shop stewards, the (male) shop stewards should insure that women are coopted to give a proper representation."

Many British unions have carried equal pay cases to the special courts (called "Industrial Tribunals") that hear complaints under the Equal Pay Act. Some unions, to be sure, show no interest in such cases. Many unions, however, do see the close connection between the fight for equal pay and the recruitment of women workers. Among these unions are some which are of left-wing leadership and others which are of moderate leadership. These unions have won a number of equal pay cases for women.

In some of these equal pay cases, the unions have prevented large companies from chiseling on especially vulnerable and exploited workers. For example, a number of cases have involved toilet cleaners. In one case the women complained because they were getting 10 Pounds a week (then almost $20 a week) less than the male toilet cleaners. The Personnel Director for manual labor of the employer, a heavy machinery manufacturer, tried to convince the court that cleaning men's toilets was much harder work than cleaning women's toilets. The union representative happened to have made a little study of the question, and he gave enough evidence to disprove this nonsensical argument. Then the Personnel Director brought up his supposedly clinching argument. I quote: "A male toilet cleaner has to approach his job from the laboring point of view but a female toilet cleaner approaches it from a housekeeping point of view." This was supposed to be worth 10 Pounds a week difference. The court, I am glad to report, found in favor of women. The women might not have won without union representation.

Several British unions, both manual and white collar, of both moderate and left-wing leadership, have supported women's strikes for equal pay. The most spectacular was led by the women sewing seat covers at Ford's Dagenham plant. That was in 1968. Although the women were skilled workers, they were graded as unskilled because they were women. Management offered them equal pay if they agreed to do shift work. They refused, but demanded equal pay and the upgrading of their jobs. Management refused and the women immediately struck. They struck on their own, but their union immediately made the strike official. The strike brought the plant to a standstill. The women got the grade they demanded and there were no requirements of shift work attached. The strike gave a major impetus to getting the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party to take seriously equal pay legislation, which then went through Parliament two years later.

In one of many equal pay strikes by white-collar workers in Britain, TASS struck the Bronx Engineering Company for three weeks in 1976. The outcome was that, after a job evaluation exercise that the union insisted on, of the 50 women in the union, all but two got increases, most of them about 250 Pounds, but some of them going as high as 500 Pounds, a year. It was not only women who gained, however; eight young draftsmen also got increases and other increases were promised some higher-paid men as soon as the then-current pay restraints were lifted.

Equal opportunity bargaining and monitoring are enlarging the scope of union action. They are getting unions into areas in which they hitherto had not done much or anything. There areas include: recruitment to training and employment, hiring, job assignment, on-the-job training.

The most extensive bargaining on equal opportunity has been taking place in Sweden recently. The two big national labor federations -- LO for manual workers, with over 2,000,000 members (this in a nation of only 8,300,000 people) and TCO, the white-collar federation, which is over 1,000,000 strong -- both signed national peak-level equal opportunity agreements with the private-sector employers' confederation in 1977. Of course, equal opportunity has to be implemented and monitored at the plant or office level; it means nothing if left simply at the peak level. Further bargaining has been going on to get agreements at each national union level and to create joint equality committees at the establishment level.

Let me report on a single case, involving one big public corporation, the Swedish National Telecommunications Administration; in Swedish it is called Televerket. There is time to look only at the training clauses of this full and precise policy statement, which was worked out after a large experimental program involving the national unions and, particularly, working groups of local unions and management in two cities.

You know the importance of the inequalities in training. In-service training for better jobs is usually offered only to men. If any training at all is offered to women, it is usually only for better performance of the subordinate jobs they already have. One remarkable aspect of the Televerket program is that management and the union people worked it out, not in the period of labor shortages (which had lasted through much of the 50s, 60s, and early 70s) but when Sweden was already threatened with serious unemployment.

Televerket begins by going to the schools with the news of its equal opportunity program, and telling girls and boys of the possibilities of jobs of all sorts for both sexes. Each staff unit in the Administration has the responsibility of telling the schools about the chances in its area, and union people go into the schools along with the management people. The policy statement pinpoints responsibilities for implementing and monitoring specific programs. It does not leave these responsibilities vague, as some policy agreements or statements do.

At their very induction, new employees get the idea that they need not be stuck in a pigeonhole if that is what they find their first assignment to be. At induction, new employees are told about the possibilities of leaves of absence for study and training, and for child care, which will be provided if they need it in order to take training.

At the other end of the seniority spectrum, long-service employees also have the right to training that will qualify them for new kinds of work. Usually there would be a requirement of a high school diploma for such training, but now that is waived for long-service employees.

In setting up programs of training, and in selecting employees to train, the aim of greater sex equality is prominent. The aim is to overcome, or at least diminish, the under-representation of either sex in any job category. "Under-representation" is defined as less than 35 percent of the positions in any category.

In any category in which one sex is under-represented; for example, women among telephone installers, more vacancies must be provided for that sex in the training program. All the advanced forms of training that used to be closed to women, in whatever type of job, have been opened to women.

The Televerket Administration is investing more in the training of women, and particularly women in the low and intermediate salary ranges. It is preparing them for more responsible jobs, not just for the better performance of their current jobs. The planning of courses and the selection of trainees take account of that aim.

Televerket is trying to influence attitudes in favor of real equality, not just formal equality. The Administration provides "equality packages" of materials for a whole series of technical and executive training courses ranging from the installation of telephone sets to personnel management. These materials are also used in information meetings and spare-time study circles. By the end of this year the equality materials are expected to be integrated into all these courses, no longer requiring special "equality packages."

Child care is arranged for employees with small children who take in-service training courses at residential schools. The course organizers are responsible for making the arrangements for child care.

The program opens up opportunities for guidance and training for new types of work for both men and women. It encourages information and study visits that may help women and men to see the value for them of taking jobs that go counter to the old sex segregation of employment. Persons interested in what Televerket people call "other-sex jobs" may get a weeks' practical training in such a job. In a two-weeks' experimental training period, some 30 "undecided" candidates took "other-sex jobs" on this trial basis. Only three of them withdrew after the trial period, while the other 27 stayed with their new type of job. Women and men may also try new lines of work by substituting for other employees who are on sick leave or vacation.

Let me mention just one result. Early on, some women trying out manual jobs complained about the especially hard work they had in digging postholes and laying conduit pipe. That is not surprising. What was surprising, however, was the response of many of the men already doing such jobs. Instead of deriding the women for their physical weakness, the men said that they too had long found this work too heavy, but they had not complained because they didn't want to be ridiculed as weaklings and sissies. Now they spoke up. They were saying, "This work is too heavy; we must do something about it."

Safety and Health

The best chances for women to achieve union office come when unions expand to organize new territory and new firms, or when they expand their functions. Then new jobs open up, and the women can run for office, or seek appointed office, without competing with men, or at least without competing with men who already hold the offices in question. So, women gain by the vast expansion of health and safety activities by unions in all four countries that we have been studying.

I shall talk mostly about Sweden because there health and safety work is most widely developed, and there the powers of the unions and their representatives are the most extensive. These powers are the result of a combination of national collective bargaining, with peak-level agreements in 1976, and a law which went into effect in mid-1978, in which the Swedish Parliament more or less enacted the collective agreement into law. The unions were given great new powers in the protection of safety and health of workers, first by the national collective agreements and then by the law. Everything is now bargainable in the safety and health field, and management must furnish all relevant material to the union safety representatives.

A safety steward must be chosen by union election or union appointment in any workplace employing more than five persons. He or she has the power to close down any operation which he or she believes imminently dangerous to life. He or she also has the power to close down any operation which he or she believes imminently dangerous to health. When this clause was first inserted in the law, employers were very worried about it, but they themselves now admit that the power to shut down operations has not been abused by union safety stewards. The law provides that, if the shutting down of an operation turns out to be a mistake the union steward is not responsible for any financial loss to the employer.

On joint safety committees, which are required by law, the union representatives have a majority of one. The joint safety committees now have control of the company health service. By law, the company health service is no longer under the control of management.

The Swedish law seeks to prevent the kind of dithering ineffectiveness which afflicts so many joint safety committees in America, in which no management representative has the power to commit the employer to anything, but says that he has to clear everything higher up. In Sweden the law and the national collective agreement require that at least one of the management representatives on the joint safety committee must come from the establishment's top management.

One of the problems everywhere is that the small establishment cannot afford proper health services, and says it is too poor to introduce the necessary engineering controls or even the necessary personal protective devices for workers. Sweden solves this problem by providing that there be joint company health centers for small and medium-sized firms. Thus small employers can draw on the necessary specialized safety and health services. By 1977, no less than 170 such joint centers were in operation. In addition, full-time union safety stewards on a regional basis circulate among those establishments too small to have their own full-time safety stewards.

With these great responsibilities and these new powers of safety stewards, obviously the question of training is of primary importance. There have been training programs before. What is new is the scope of the training programs and the tremendous numbers involved. The training is on released time, paid for by the employers. The employers likewise pay for the informational materials, which are very widely distributed.

The trade union confederation insisted in collective bargaining that safety and health training be chiefly at the local and plant levels, and by discussion groups, rather than in lectures by company safety engineers at residential schools. Employers were reluctant but they finally agreed. The local setting gives women a much better chance of participating than do residential schools. The local training also makes it possible, as the union insisted, that the trainees examine their workplaces and report on situations which need correction in the plant or office in which the stewards themselves work. The foremen take these courses with the stewards.

Between the end of 1974 and September 1978, a total of about 300,000 men and women had taken this training for safety stewards and foremen. If a similar proportion of the American population had taken such training, it would have given us no fewer than 8,000,000 workers and foremen in basic safety courses during that period of less than four years.

In Great Britain, Austria, and Germany the law likewise mandates the training of safety and health representatives. (In Germany and Austria, this is a function of the works councillors, of whom I spoke earlier.) This training they take on paid released time. Most of the training, as in Sweden, is done by the unions, locally or in residential schools. About fiftenn percent of the works councillors in both Germany and Austria are women. About twenty-five percent of the safety stewards chosen by the unions in Sweden so far are women. So, in all four of these countries, you can see large numbers of women taking training courses that build their knowledge and competence, their self-confidence and their visibility, their capacity to serve the men and women they work with, and their opportunities for further union service.

WORKSHOP REPORTS

Gloria Johnson,
Education Director,
International Union of
Electrical, Radio and
Machine Workers

Collective Bargaining

We had a very representative and very good size group, considering the time of day. I think there was general agreement, however, that we really didn't have enough time to do justice to the subject.

We did feel, though, that perhaps we could deal with most of the issues by presenting them in a series of questions, prefaced by what I think is extremely important, and that is; why this issue itself is important in this day and time. I think it is important and there was agreement to this -- that on the one hand we have this large influx of women into the labor movement, we have equal employment laws on the books (and they have been there for about 15 years or more), we have CLUW, we have guidelines for women moving into the apprenticeship trades, we have women now in leadership positions and more are moving into these positions (into women's departments as well as on executive boards). At the same time, on the other side of the coin, we are trying to function in a very conservative climate -- the climate that is characterized by some Supreme Court decisions that we feel have had, and probably will continue to have an adverse effect on both women and minorities; the right wing in its attack on the labor movement; high unemployment which is still with us -- and we are hearing all the time that this is due to the fact that there are so many women, so many young people and so many old people in the work force.

So, we are caught between these two extremes, making it even more important that we try to get as much into our collective bargaining agreements to move towards equality as is possible. So, the questions we dealt with and attempted to get some answers to were these:

- What are the issues that we feel can be dealt with through collective bargaining?
- What is the women's role in the process?
- Are women serving on collective bargaining committees? If they are not, what can be done to increase their involvement?
- What is the importance of women's involvement in collective bargaining and the whole area of organizing? Is there any tie between this and organizing?

- Is there some difficulty in getting women's issues on the table?
- Is there also difficulty in getting men to see women's issues as really union issues?
- What kinds of support systems do we have available to us?

I will just review some of these very briefly. When we looked at the issues, these included such things as: child care, personal time off from the job, comparable work, parental leave, maternity benefits, pregnancy disability benefits, tuition refunds, concept of paid educational leave, job posting, seniority, grievance and arbitration as they relate to the question of comparable worth, and proportional representation of women on collective bargaining committees.

We dealt with child care and the experiences of one or two people in the workshop indicating the difficulties that we have, generally with trying to push child care in the contracts. There were differences of opinion about child care. For example, depending on what part of the country you come from, there are those women who believe very strongly that this is a family issue and has nothing to do with the union. There are men in these same areas who believe, very frankly, that child care is the "woman's responsibility so let her take care of it and let's keep it away from the collective bargaining area."

Where it has been presented, there frequently was an unwillingness on the part of some people in this particular local to give up something -- to trade off something -- for child care benefits. In other words, it has not really been established as a priority issue in the collective bargaining demands.

When we looked at the concept of seniority, our feelings were that what we ought to do in our contracts is to push hard for plant-wide seniority. The experience of some has been that once you have converted to plant-wide seniority as it applies to upgrading and promotions especially women who have been the last hired (in many instances in a particular department that has departmental seniority) are moved upwards into higher paying jobs as a result. This group felt that this is one way that we could perhaps move closer to equality for women by extending or by expanding the application of seniority.

Another possible answer is job posting. In many instances when there has not been job posting, the "buddy system" has been developed in certain departments in the plants where there are all men, which serves to provide information about job opportunities. Now women who are generally concentrated in lower jobs don't know about these jobs. We feel that what we need to push for is full job posting for all jobs. As someone in the workshop indicated, it would be very difficult, for example, if the job posting only took place in the men's room. Not too many of us go there. So, it would be a lot better if we make sure that not only do we have job posting but that it is made available to everybody.

One major concern is this whole question of comparable worth. It was generally agreed, I think, that the equal pay legislation of 1963 has done remarkably well in helping to bring equality for women in wages. But, unfortunately, the Act does not apply to most situations in which we find working women. Men and women generally do not do the same work, so comparisons under the Equal Pay Act are limited. What is unfortunate is that women's work is given less value than men's work, a fact well reflected in wages for women's work.

The problem is that we know in some plants the janitors receive 15 cents to 50 cents an hour more than the highest paid woman in these plants. This brings us to the question of comparable worth. So far, very frankly, we have not been successful in negotiating a clause for comparable work or even getting discrepancies corrected under the law in the courts. In fact, the concept is not too popular because of the so-called expense involved in correcting these inequities. It is an issue, and a very important one, so we need to look at how we can deal with this through collective bargaining.

Do we have difficulty translating women's concern into union issues? Frequently, yes. The truth is women's issues are union issues. There are ways of making that point clearer. For example, if you want to get male support for the ERA, just show, for example, the overlapping of the non-ratified states with the right-to-work states and present it in that fashion. Twelve of the non-ERA states are right-to-work states.

And, as a good welfare comment at the very end: for support systems we feel that CLUW has served in this capacity. We are publishing a book -- a 32-page book on model contract language which will be available in a couple of weeks and will cost $1.00 an issue. You can order them through Lisa Portman, who is the Task Force Chair of Contract Language in the Coalition of Labor Union Women. We can only improve our contracts if we improve the way we think about the whole issue of equality. Thank you.

WORKSHOP REPORTS

Anne Nelson, Co-Director,
Institute for Education and
Research on Women and Work,
Cornell University

Training Women for Leadership

Our workshop talked about "Training Women for Leadership Responsibility." Union women are leaders in the women's movement. We work with NOW; we work with the Women's Political Caucus; we work with many of the feminists organizations in the country, and guess which women have their act together: the union women!

This, I think, is a tribute to labor and I think it is a very great tribute to your women members. In the United States the growth of women in the labor force has been phenomenal. And, we want to draw your attention to this -- 25 percent of organized labor is female now. Eli Ginsberg has called the growth of women in the labor force the single greatest phenomenon of the century -- more important than communism, more important than atomic energy. No wonder the men are scared to death, as one of my workshop participants said.

We can understand it. We would hope to allay any such fears. Union women are different from many other women. They are intensely loyal to their union. In the survey that Barbara Wertheimer and I did of the participation of women in New York City locals, we had responses from both men and women. One response we weren't looking for (this was just an accidental thing that came out of our questionnaire survey) showed that women unionists are enormously loyal to their unions and men aren't. The men are shooting down their leaders. They think of business agents as riding around in Cadillacs, using up the dues. But the women look on their leaders with respect.

Women, as you all know, are the backbone of the union. They value it. They know that without a union they are members of the secondary workforce -- it is their protection. Only 11 percent of all women are organized. Yet we are one-quarter of the labor movement. The new women who are entering labor's ranks are joining all the women who have contributed in the past and not been recognized for it. And the new women are restless. They understand as well as the old ones do, how much the union means to them, but they want to have a more active part in it.

In order to take a more active part, women need a little more encouragement than men do. Our new people need to learn that their work is valued by the union. If it is, they will turn out and undertake many of the jobs that remain undone. I don't think labor can get along without the influx of leadership talent that is available out there from the women.

The purpose of our workshop was to try to focus on the kind of education we call leadership training, because leadership starts first with participation, and then moves on to more responsibility. In our workshop we had a cross-section of union and university educators who want to begin to respond to the desires of women for training so they can participate and contribute more. Now, what did we find? Among our participants, we found most programs are still in the planning stage. I want to tell you that this is late for the planning stage. We have a few universities that have run special women's conferences. AFSCME is planning a series of regional conferences all around the country. CWA for four days last September ran a big breakthrough national conference in Minneapolis for their women on leadership training.

Other unions and universities also are doing or thinking about doing things. Very often it is taking the form of an add-on at a summer school or a convention. That is a good place to start. And everybody, I hope, is scheduling at their conventions and summer schools -- some kind of session on the concerns of women, or planning special opportunities for the women to get together and discuss union building.

Cornell has the most extensive education program, that is the program I represent, Trade Union Women Studies, which is a full year, college program carrying nine Cornell credits. We also have been active in starting regional summer schools for union women in the south, the northeast, the west, and the middle-west. We want you to know that at Cornell we were fortunate enough to get some grant money to start a women's program for trade unionists. We have been able to develop special course materials and that is something labor educators often don't have time for. But, you do need them. And, you do need to know that the standard materials often are conveying a bad message. I was conscious of it while I was having coffee with Duane Beeler and he was talking to me about the changes he has made in his own materials as a result of the new importance of women in the trade union movement.

It is important to use new materials that offset the message that women aren't there when important events occur; that all the action is taking place among male unionists in the rank and file and male unionists at the leadership level. We will be very happy to share our course materials with you. We have a materials list that is free to everyone. We invite you to build on our stewards' training and other courses, and add specially developed materials for women to your regular programs.

The central question that our seminar discussed was whether or not there should be programs for women only. I would say that largely the trade union movement is not receptive to this idea; there is a fear. You are not sure, if you are a man, what is going on when the women get together and talk about trade union matters.

There is a fear of this incubus, this special virus -- these women are going to talk about trade union affairs. I don't know if it is possible for me to allay those fears. I would just like to say one sentence and that is: what we are talking about -- I am in a women's program now, but I am out of traditional labor education -- is just straight old labor education before the women's program came around. We are talking about the same things we talked about then. It is just that women are getting a chance to talk. By and large our experience at Cornell is that women are too intimidated to talk very much when they are in a mixed group and when they are in a minority.

So, don't be that worried. We are just really doing that straight old labor education. And what we are emphasizing is the importance of unionism and the importance of women's part in it.

I would say our workshop split somewhat along sex lines -- on whether or not there should be separate programs for women only. The men tended to think there should not be separate programs, and the women all thought there should be. There was some variation in response. But I don't think there was any doubt that everyone thought there should be programming on women's issues with women as a special target audience.

Our sister Barbara Stanton from Hawaii has a very important point in saying, "Women have to prove that they are more competent." I don't think there is any question about that in any of our minds. Women really do have to prove they are more competent in order to get into union positions that are available to those people who are male. We are not even objecting to that requirement. But how do you get to be more competent? You have to go someplace to get those skills and get that training. We hope that you will be among those who will wish to give it to the women.

On the question of training for men -- this is a serious problem and this is the other issue our workshop talked about. We want special programming for women, but do we also need to start writing special programs for men who wish to understand what is happening among women? There the women sat back and said, "If you guys think it's important to have programming to try to understand women's issues, or what women are doing when we go off to our own sessions, then it is important and we ought to be doing it. But we don't know how to do it." We really do not know because we don't quite share your anxiety. We feel very weak and it is surprising to us that we are viewed as threatening. We don't feel that way at all. We are just trying to get up those first few rungs. But apparently we are seen as threatening. We are not quite sure how to handle this kind of question, yet our workshop members all did seem to feel they wanted that kind of programming.

We don't know how to do it very successfully. I would welcome the men putting their thought together on this question. We would be more than glad to cooperate. I suppose small seminars. . .when you are talking to people who are half way persuaded, you can do a good job but if you are talking to guys who are very negative, I don't know how you get through. Maybe it can only be men talking to other men on those kinds of issues.

These were some of the points that were raised by people at the table. I would say that the general conclusion is that there should be separate programming for women at least initially, not for forever, but initially. Women should put their heads together and begin to learn self-confidence and self-respect. But a woman can only get that if she has peers that she is working with and not people who regard her as inferior.

Roberta Till-Retz contributed the fact that in Sweden and in Germany where the unions began separate women's programs, they later wiped them out and moved back to joint education, thinking they had advanced beyond the need for separate women's programming. In those countries the women are saying, "Quit kidding us. We have to have women's programs. We have to get back to that again." So, I am going to leave you with that message. Separate programs have a very important place for women.

The second message from the workshop is that something ought to be done to interpret women's goals to men, to explain that union building is what is going on, and to bring us together as brothers and sisters. That, of course, is what we intend to be but we want to be strong sisters, not weak. The third message is that there is something available for your right now. The women's summer schools that are coming up. We have them in the north at Cornell, in the midwest at Kenyon, and in the south at the University of Alabama. I urge you to see if you can't get some of your own people out to these summer schools.

WORKSHOP REPORTS

Marge Rachlin,
Senior Staff Associate,
George Meany Center for Labor Studies

Adapting Union Structure and Activities

Our workshop was asked to discuss what we can learn from the way that European unions have adapted their structure and their functioning to make a special place for women. Our group agreed that the problem is the same -- high numbers of women in many unions, but very few women on Executive Boards, on bargaining committees, as joint board managers, directing business reps, not enough women on field staff and not enough women on local union executive boards. The group is concerned about that problem we have talked about forever, which is encouraging participation; we are also concerned about representation of women -- women have too little input on policy-making in the union at all levels. Additionally, the issues and concerns special to women are seldom addressed vigorously by the union.

The first topic we talked about was whether we could use special women's divisions at the federation level, that is, the AFL-CIO level (I am comparing it to the DGB in Germany), or at the national union level. In Europe these special divisions are used to build women's skills, to give them a chance to get together and learn from each other, to help them focus on issues of special concern to working women in that union, and to gain confidence, with the notion that they will then move forward into the larger union picture.

In this country we actually have women's departments in maybe eight unions. In few cases are they as well staffed as in some European unions and in few cases do they have an effective structure that reaches down to the regional or district level in the national union. We just don't have the staff or the structure in most of our union women's offices that they do in Europe.

What did the group think about this? Our group could not decide whether they believe in a special place for women in some special structure for women in a union. There were people in the group who felt that having special divisions for women would be divisive. There were also people who felt it might work in some unions but not in the union where the membership was already 80 percent women or not in a union that was so small that there was no staff to do anything anyway. So, we just never settled that question.

We did agree that where there is a women's caucus (and in some cases these are "human rights" caucuses) in a union they have been very effective at national conventions. One person in our group told how, as a result of the impetus given by International Women's Year, the women delegates to her convention got themselves organized and put pressure on the union to (a) hire its first woman staff person and (b) set up a system where there is a woman at the district level in every district. This is proving enormously helpful.

We also agreed that women's committees, or whatever they are called, at the state level are useful. We have heard about the Women's Affirmative Action Committee of the New Jersey Industrial Union Council. We also have effective women's committees in a few other states. I would name, for example, the state AFL-CIO of Washington which has a terrific women's committee. In some states, a good women's committee at the state federation level acts as a women's caucus.

The group accepts caucuses as being the traditional American way. We also talked about "networking" and how important that is to women. All of us need support, advice, counsel, somebody to turn to for information. Where you have a caucus, or where you have any kind of women's committee set-up in a union, you have a kind of network. The biggest network, of course, the biggest organizational structure the labor women have built is CLUW.. Because of CLUW we know women all over the country and in many different unions who cannot only work together but help if we need information. It is interesting that we have CLUW in this country, an independent organization of largely women trade unionists. They do not have groups like that in Europe. Possibly this is a response to the fact that we have no women's divisions.

What can we do to get more women into leadership at the national, local and middle levels? We discussed staff as well as "elected leadership." There was general agreement that we can't wait until women work their way up the ladder or until they slug their way up through some local unions that we know. There is a feeling that we need to put more emphasis on informal quotas. That is, we need to think about more women as vice presidents and on executive boards at the national level, more women appointed on staff, more women "blessed" to be business agents. One point made is that many people in the union are not simply elected in an out-and-out contest where the best man wins or the best woman wins. Many times in our unions people are "blessed" -- vice presidents pick the next vice president, and the directing business rep picks the next business rep. We feel there should be more attention paid to putting women in union positions in those ways.

Some locals, where there are a lot of women, are already using "slating." They are saying "We have to have women as officers; we have to have women as business agents and we are going to put them on the slate."

In our workshop we never solved the problem that women who have homes and family responsibilities often feel they can't take that 24-hour-a-day union job which requires you to fly from Chicago to Louisville to Miami this week. The European suggestion, and even they haven't done very much about this, is that we restructure the jobs -- that the union staff job is inhumane for men and women alike. There is a point to that. We also discussed the problem of child care for women who want to be active at the local level but usually the local provides no facilities.

Let me give you a terrific idea on child care from British unions. One British union is giving people who leave children at home a babysitting allowance for conventions. They will give it to either the male or female who has children at home and who must get somebody to care for them while they are gone. That may be a better idea than providing child care at the convention site.

Lastly, we are concerned about other groups in the union who are not sufficiently represented. One of the problems of the special place for women is what about Blacks and Hispanics. We see a need to raise the consciousness of all those unrepresented groups so they demand more voice and more input. Just as the civil rights movement in this country was a very divisive, difficult experience for labor and for the country, in the long run we are better for it and the country is better for it. Similarly, being concerned about greater representation for these special groups in the union may make many difficulties now but in the long run we will be better for solving it. On that uplifting note I leave you.

WORKSHOP REPORTS

George E. O'Connell, Director,
Labor Education Center,
University of Connecticut

Health and Safety Programs

Our workshop dealt with promotion equality through occupational safety and health programs. The workshop participants concluded that promoting equality means some of the following actions:

First, it means union training programs aimed at revealing the discriminatory nature of company regulations and OSHA standards which ban all women of childbearing age from jobs in which exposure to toxic substances may cause death or deformities in fetuses.

Second, it means attending an IUD OSHA Conference on March 28 and 29 aimed at lobbying Congress not to destroy or weaken the OSHA Act and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Third, promotion equality also means promoting the partipation of women on safety committees and negotiating teams so that perspectives dealing with the specific needs and concerns of women will be expressed and acted upon at the bargaining table and through the grievance process.

Fourth, it also means the union developing its own enforcement tactics on the shop floor level to improve workplace safety and health. For example (and this was one of the examples that came from a female who was involved in organizing workers,) male and female workers could slow down or refuse to work under hazardous conditions until these conditions were made safe for both sexes rather than women being excluded from high risk jobs and men being expected to express a macho disregard for safety and health.

Fifth, it means looking for cost-effective solutions aimed at avoiding the contracting out of work and the migration of firms to southern states or foreign countries.

Sixth, it means political lobbying for national standards and enforcement aimed at creating hazard-free work environments in all 50 states. Such a national approach reduces the loss of jobs by both men and women because of companies moving to states with less regulation.

Seventh, it means successfully dealing with the employment and job security concerns of workers as a basis of overcoming the reluctance and fears of many workers to support safety and health enforcement.

Eighth, it means lobbying for economic incentives which will reward companies for voluntary compliance.

Ninth, it means educating the rank and file so that they are willing to stand up, not only for their safety and health rights, but for equal opportunity rights. The group was very much aware of the relationship between occupational safety and health legislation and equal rights legislation.

Tenth, it means writing contract clauses aimed at protecting pregnant women who must temporarily transfer from high risk jobs -- clauses aimed at guaranteeing equal pay, seniority rights, pregnancy leaves, maternity benefits and other practices.

Finally, it means subscribing to a $6 newsletter put out by the Women's Occupational Health Resource Center. This is a national clearinghouse to provide information and insight regarding the occupational safety and health rights of women. Write to Jeanne Stellman, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, New York 10017.

These are some of the actions, some of the basic ideas, that came out of our workshop. There were other ideas but these were the main ones.

Thank you.

Anne Clark,
Program Coordination Office,
National Endowment for the Arts

I want to give you a bit of background information on the National Endowment for the Arts and then to discuss a few of the union-related projects with which we have been or are currently involved.

The National Endowment for the Arts is an independent agency of the federal government. It was created in 1965 to encourage and assist the nation's cultural resources. First year funding for the Arts Endowment totalled $2,500,000. Approximately 1,800 applications were received that year and we made some 140 grants. Current year funding for the Arts Endowment is just under $150,000,000. We are anticipating close to 20,000 applications and will probably make in the vicinity of 4,000 grants.

While primarily a grant-making organization, we also engage in a number of non-grant making leadership activities as well. The Arts Endowment is advised by the 26 member Presidentially-appointed National Council on the Arts. The Council meets four or five times a year to advise on policies and programs and to review and make recommendations on applications for financial assistance.

In its grant-making and leadership activities, the Endowment's overall goals are to help develop, preserve, and make more widely available arts of the highest quality throughout the country. We also work to encourage support for the arts from other sectors.

Grants are made directly to individual artists and to non-profit, tax-exempt organizations. Grants to organizations are for specific projects and not for general support. Grants are made through each of our 14 major program areas. Most of these programs relate to specific art forms -- architecture, literature, visual arts, dance, music, theater, opera and musical theater, museums, and media arts. Several of our programs are interdisciplinary in nature. These include the federal-state partnership, the program through which we work with the state arts agencies, our education program which focuses on placing professional artists in residence in elementary and secondary schools, expansion arts which focuses on professionally directed community based arts activities, folk arts and special projects.

In addition, the Endowment also has a challenge grant program which is open to all fields which we assist. Challenge grants offer special one-time support. They are made at a higher level than our other grants. They have strict matching requirements and are designed to help grantees achieve a permanent increase in their level of support from non-federal sources.

Each of our grant-making programs is advised by a panel of individuals who are expert in that particular art field. Panels meet regularly to review and make recommendations on applications. Their recommendations are passed on to the National Council on the Arts, and the National Council's final recommendations go on to the Chairman for final determination.

In our funding the Endowment attempts to act as a catalyst and to stimulate support for the arts and activity in the arts among other sectors as well. While grants to individuals carry no matching requirement, grants to organizations are generally made on a matching basis. Therefore, if an organization receives $25,000 for a specific project, they must provide at least $25,000 in other funds for that same activity. And, most of our grants are actually matched at a higher rate than the $1.00 in non-federal funds required for each federal $1.00. We generally do not provide funding to new organizations and we always discourage any dependency on federal funding for any major portion of an organization's total budget.

In our programming and funding we are careful not to interfere in or to direct the activities of any individual artist or arts organization. We view our role primarily as one of responding to needs and developments in the field and among the constituencies we serve.

While criteria for support vary somewhat from one Endowment program to the next, all Endowment panels and the National Council place the greatest emphasis on artistic quality. While there isn't and never will be one definition of what constitutes artistic quality, it is strongly felt that the system of application review by peer panels is crucial to maintaining the highest standards and to responding to the needs and opportunities in the field.

In addition to our grant-making, we also engage in a variety of leadership activities. This includes working with other federal agencies to encourage them to draw on and to assist the arts. We have a number of activities underway in the area of federal architecture. We have been working with the Civil Service Commission to help them improve hiring practices for federal designers and we have been working with a number of federal agencies to help them improve the quality of their printed materials.

Endowment staff and Council members have also taken an increasingly active role in advocating legislation and regulatory policies which are favorable to artists and art institutions. Examples include areas such as copyright and tax reform.

We are also becoming involved in a campaign to stimulate greater awareness of the needs of the handicapped. We are trying to provide technical assistance to arts organizations as they try to make provisions for the handicapped in their facilities and in their programming.

In addition to working with other federal agencies, we also work closely with a variety of other groups, both public and private, at the state and local levels. There are now state agencies in each of the 50 states in five special jurisdictions. These agencies have a special relationship with the Endowment. A portion of our appropriation each year is legislatively mandated to go to the state arts agencies and the state arts agencies carry out many of the functions at the state level that the Endowment itself carries out on a national level.

There is also a growing network of community arts agencies throughout the country. We are also working to develop closer ties with other members of the private sector such as service organizations, professional associations, foundations, businesses, corporations, and other groups.

Among those groups who have become increasingly active in the arts over the past several years are the labor unions. We have supported a number of union-related projects that I think you might be particularly interested in. One of these takes place at the George Meany Center and, I understand, in this room. That is the "Wednesday Night Live" series which features local artists in the performing and the visual arts.

More recently, the Arts Endowment has provided support to the Labor Studies Center for a consultant who is working with the Labor Institute for Human Enrichment to develop new projects to make the arts more accessible to a greater number of working people.

One of our major projects is taking place in New York City. That is at the District 1199 Cultural Center, the headquarters for the National Union of Hospital and Health Care Employees. The project is entitled, "Bread and Roses". It is designed to provide 1199 members with a wide range of arts activities at the place where they live and work. I will not go into detail, as I understand you will be hearing much more about this project in a few moments.

In Michigan, the Greater Flint Arts Council has received support for an artist-in-residence program at Flint area automotive plants. This project was designed in cooperation with local unions there.

In Pennsylvania, the State Council on the Arts has received assistance over the past several years for a program designed to develop a liaison between union members, their families, and organizations and the state's artists and arts organizations. I understand that that project has been working very well and has generated a number of exciting activities.

This is by no means a total listing of the union-related activities with which we have been involved, but it will give you a bit of an idea of some of the projects which the Endowment has assisted. We hope that this involvement is one that will be increasing in the future.

I have with me some somewhat out-of-date brochures that give more detailed information on each of the Endowment's programs and I will leave these with you. Our new Guide to Programs, which is the best source of information on all of the Endowment's activities, outlines program by program the different categories under which support is available and what you have to do to apply. The new Guide will be out sometime in May. If there are any of you who would be interested in receiving that, I would be happy to get your name and address here.

Thank you.

Len Oliver,
Special Assistant to the Chairman,
National Endowment for the Humanities

Why should labor be interested in the humanities? Or the humanities in labor? Our agency is 13 years old, and it is only in the last few years that we have established solid working relationships with labor. We are talking about 21,000,000 workers in organized labor, multiplied by a factor of 4 for families, for a total of some 80,000,000 people -- most of whom have been underrepresented in the cultural dollar. The money is there, but labor has not seen the Endowment as a place to come for funding. At times, we do go to labor unions and work with them to develop competitive proposals.

For instance, the project with District 1199, "Bread and Roses," started with a three hour discussion with Moe Foner; the result is a $300,000 grant for a humanities component -- oral histories, the lecture series, the exhibits and discussions, and retiree programs. The "Bread and Roses" project should be a model for other unions around the country.

There is a vital and mutually beneficial relationship to be forged between the humanities and labor. We both are interested in the "whole person." We are interested in the worker as a citizen, family member, neighbor. We are interested in union history, social history, labor curriculum, issue discussion programs, labor-related seminars, and films about labor. In looking through your program I saw at least four or five areas which the humanities could have supported: discussions of "right-to-work" laws in Missouri, perhaps supported by our state humanities committee; raising issues about the workplace and the meaning of work; and occupational safety (a recent grant to the Oil, Chemical and Atomic workers helped them with a conference in New York for 180 physicians on the history of occupational safety, on questions of ethics, and so on).

One question is how to develop programs in the humanities with labor. It cannot be a simplistic taking of programs to the workers; the programs must relate to their interests and needs, their deepest concerns.

The humanities can also assist labor in raising social, political and cultural issues to enable workers, as citizens, to develop deeper understandings of the workings of our society.

There is a rich history of worker education in this country and abroad. In Great Britain, with the Workers Education Association, worker education has been equated to liberal studies -- the humanities. In the United States, we seem to be more interested in tool subjects. Much of what you've done at this conference, for example, lies in practical areas such as collective bargaining and leadership issues, but there is another dimension that the humanities can help with, and I think that is what we would like you to talk to us about.

Some of our labor projects deal with union histories, or discussions of contemporary issues, or like our program with the George Meany Center, the documentation through oral histories of the key people around at the time of the merger.

Ideally, every union should be able to document its own history. Ideally, all 21,000,000 organized workers and possibly their families should have access to credit programs in the humanities and/or non-credit, off campus programs. There should be increased numbers of materials for the public to help to sensitize the public about the labor movement and the role of the labor movement. There should be more television programs about labor, depicting people at work. There should be more pamphlets and study guides. Above all, we need more labor curriculum materials in the schools. AFT now has a proposal in to NEH to introduce substantive objective labor materials into the curriculum in the elementary and secondary schools.

But how do you relate to this agency? First, start with your ideas. If I am talking to labor people, I want to find out what you are interested in, where your interests in the humanities lie. We want your ideas.

Secondly, test your ideas on us. Send me a piece of paper -- one page or two pages. I will get it into the mix, get you a response and put you together with the right people. That is how most of these labor projects come about.

Thirdly, understand our constraints. We are a humanities agency, we have a list of disciplines and that is what we fund. We cannot fund social action.

You have to have almost a naive belief in education -- that education is revelation that affects the individual and that education in the humanities can be potentially beneficial to labor's interests.

Connie Kopelov, Education Director,
National Union of Hospital
and Health Care Employees

Bread and Roses Project

The Bread and Roses project is probably the most ambitious cultural program any union has undertaken. It is not only the effect of the project on 1199 but also the effect on the public and on other unions which I think you will be interested in. I also want you to be aware of the availability of some of the programming throughout the country. The ramifications just keep snowballing.

Bread and Roses consists of performances in hospitals and in large nursing homes not only in New York but in other major 1199 affiliates in Connecticut and Pennsylvania. Not only 1199ers but also patients and other employees in the hospital attend the performances. The first two weeks that this part of the project has been going on in the hospitals, there have been about 5,000 people who have come to performances. You might also be interested in knowing that the second round of performances is the Labor Theater's production of a shortened version of "I Just Wanted Someone to Know," which is the story of the inner lives of working women written by Betty Craig and Joyce Kornbluh.

The programs have been videotaped. They may be available for other communities around the country. So, some of this may be accessible even after the performances have ended in forms that would be useful at union affairs.

Another piece of Bread and Roses is an oral history project that some workers are participating in. Ossie Davis, Micki Grant and Eve Merriam are going to make a dramatic presentation or a musical out of what these 1199ers say about their working lives. It has been so successful that the people in the oral history project want to keep talking and meeting even after the material has been gathered for the purpose of producing the dramatic presentation. I thought that would be interesting to you as labor educators.

We celebrated our 20th anniversary in the hospitals with a performance -- which was sold out 6 weeks in advance -- primarily for our members at Lincoln Center's Philharmonic Hall, in which Harry Belefonte gave his first performance in 18 years and was absolutely fantastic.

One of the interesting moments of the evening: it didn't hurt to get a telegram saying, "Sorry I am in Australia and can't be with you.

If I were a hosptial worker instead of a heavyweight champion, I would get together with my fellow workers and join 1199." - Muhammad Ali

One of the valuable things made available to the public by 1199 is our permanent art gallery. The first Bread and Roses exhibit was "The Year of the Child" - we were one of the outlets for those magnificent paintings from children around the world. Our selection of paintings emphasized the themes of "work and play." We worked with the Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers to bring school children to view and discuss the exhibit. United Federation of Teachers and 1199 working together was, of course, very interesting.

I can tell that teachers read the UFT publication because many of the classes that booked into the exhibit came through a story about it in their newspaper, The New York Teacher.

We turned away as many classes as we were able to take. There were 70 classes and we turned away about 70. We didn't have enough room. The kids came in and would have a discussion about what is work and what is play and what do you see in this or that painting. And we gave all the kids a "bread and roses" button and talked a little bit about strikes and about unions. So, it had a very strong educational component for the kids. Our second "Bread and Roses" exhibit is the Earl Dotter Show which will also come to Washington to the Department of Labor's art gallery. He is a magnificent photographer. We have some groups who are coming because they are interested in photography. We have high school and college and workers' education programs coming because it is a photography exhibit called, "Rise, Gonna Rise - the story of the Southern Textile Workers." It is very powerful. A lot of it is from Roanoke Rapids and other Stevens plants. The exhibit is accompanied by a videotape about brown lung. Working with ACTWU, 1199 is trying to bring workers up from the south (especially J.P. Stevens workers) so there can be discussion with people who really work in the mills about what their life is really like, what the struggle is like or the brown lung problem. So it has a very strong educational component.

I think some of you have seen the Bread and Roses poster. It is out in the lobby and available in the Studies Center bookstore. There is an order blank which I have given to you and additional blanks are available. It has on the back an article on the Bread and Roses program from Business Week. There are articles on this program all across the country, and I think that can't hurt the labor movement. Labor needs to be seen in the great variety of roles that we do play.

So, if you get a chance to see the Dotter show here in Washington, I recommend it very much. We had 250 people at the opening and 300 to 400 people who came to an evening performance of songs from the mills. So, it is reaching many people.

Another component of Bread and Roses is a series of lectures, the first one April 1 with Andy Young at Columbia University. He is going to talk about the legacy of Martin Luther King and about non-violence. He is being interviewed by Bill Moyers who will then carry it on his TV Journal. So if any of you would like to hear Andy Young talking about non-violence, you can hear it on Bill Moyers' show.

In the material we have given out, you can read about foundations and other groups who have matched the Federal grants, and organizations who cooperate with the program. These include church groups, religious groups and other unions.

You can also come to New York on Labor Day because we are having a street fair. That is in cooperation with a unique project -- a housing development for people in the performing arts unions that happens to be located a block from 1199. They are going to provide a lot of talent for that street fair.

So, in many, many of the programs there is (and I have not touched on all of them) a lot of cooperation with a number of other groups. Many of these things are being used by educational television. I hope they will be available to us in labor education for our programs.

Michael E. Gordon,
University of Tennessee

Characteristics of Committed Union Members
A Psychological Study

It is a real pleasure to be here. I do have a lot to say and unfortunately, very little time to say it. But, I do want to speak to you about two things. First, I want to comment on the field of industrial organizational psychology, especially its relationship to management and its relationship to organized labor. Second, I want to describe some research that I have done on union commitment. This is a large project. There are three technical papers that have been produced on the results, so I can only skim the surface of the findings today.

To begin, allow me to comment about the field of industrial organizational psychology. I think the best way to define this discipline is to tell you first of all what it is not. We are not time and motion men, although for years we have been confused with the disciples of Frederick Taylor and Scientific Management. It is true that we analyze jobs, but finding out what is involved in the job is a prerequisite for all kinds of research on work. And, in a short while Stuart Schmidt will give you an example of how analysis of union jobs can be used to the benefit of organized labor.

Also, we are not mind readers. Most people become a bit wary when they sit down with a psychologist. Their concern stems from the notion that they are unintentionally giving away more information than they really want to because, somehow, psychologists have access to their sub-conscious minds. It isn't so. I would say in my own case that I am more conversant with numbers than people. If not mind readers, then what are we?

Industrial-organizational psychologists are social scientists who attempt to build models of human behavior in work organizations. What this means is that we develop concepts, variables like motivation, aptitudes, commitment and locus of control. These concepts are then combined by means of empirically derived formulae to explain behavior in work situations. In our pursuit of building this model we have become management oriented. That is, industrial-organizational psychologists have permitted management to suggest the concepts and relationships to be investigated. There are numerous indices which demonstrate how management oriented the discipline is.

For example, Father Purcell commented on the fact that only two of us seem to be employed by unions. I have my index, the Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. It was published in 1976 and contains approximately 1700 pages. This is a document which is supposed to blaze a trail for researchers in my field until the year 2000. In this text there is not a single indexed reference to organized labor or unions. That is the Gordon Index for our neglect of unions.

Why are we management oriented? There are a number of reasons. First of all, to some extent we are victims of our own success. Thanks to the psychological work that was done on behalf of the Armed Services during World War I, the business community became aware of a discipline that could help organizations in dealing with human resource problems. Since that time, they have become very good clients. Our students, my colleagues, follow the line of least resistance in looking for a site for their research, and there is a terrific corporate market for our services.

On the other side of the coin, we are also management oriented because there is little demand for our services among leaders of organized labor. We are enthusiastically ignored by unions. Shostak used the term "mutual indifference" to describe relations between organized labor and industrial psychology.[1] We go our separate ways. I can make a living by consulting with industry and teaching my classes. And you folks seem to get along without us also.

There are several reasons why industrial-organizational psychologists lack appeal in union circles. As I have already pointed out, confusion still exists between industrial-organizational psychology, scientific management, and the time study man. Also, a lot of the things that we do pose real threats to you. The psychologist's tests challenge the union person's seniority -- we have heard the Detroit-Edison case discussed. Also, there is a good deal of psychological literature which is out-and-out union busting. I am not just talking about Charlie Hughes' jelly beans and job enrichment. Rather, I have reference to what has happened to research in companies. There was a time when psychologists were seldom involved in the industrial relations sphere. Things appear to have changed. For example, last year there was an article in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, the most prestigious journal in my field, by Hamner and Smith. The paper described 13 copyrighted questionnaire items which can be used in nonunion plants to detect whether or not there is any sentiment for union organization.[2]

---

[1] Shostak, A.B. Industrial psychology and the trade unions: A matter of mutual indifference. In G. Fisk (Ed.), The Frontiers of management psychology. New York: Harper, 1964.

Lastly, even those of us who want to be of assistance to unions run into difficulty. There isn't ever a good time to do a study in a union. For example, you always seem to be having elections so that you don't want an outsider to rile the waters, or money from the strike fund may have just been loaned to another union. Obviously, these are judged to be bad times to request cooperation from the membership in a psychological study. And, of course, Mr. Schrank seemed to get a very positive response from this union audience with his anti-academic, anti-intellectual comments. So, we professors of psychology have that prevailing attitude to overcome as well.

However, maybe we can turn things around. It has been my feeling that if industrial-organizational psychologists can define an issue which really titillates unions because of its perceived utility, then maybe we can get together. The topic I have chosen to study is union commitment. The discipline of industrial-organizational psychology is sadly lacking because we have insufficient information on the matter of commitment. Talks I have had with union leaders suggest that this is an important topic from the standpoint of organized labor. Union newspapers like *Steel Labor* or *Impact* from the OPEIU, also appear to be concerned about member commitment. (There are a lot of unions which still have $20 door prizes to get people to come to the meetings.)

This was the background for the study, a feeling that some important psychological questions might be answered while at the same time developing a useful body of information on commitment for leaders of organized labor. We began the research by constructing a questionnaire. Forty-eight of the questions were written to try to measure the concept of commitment to the union. Some of the questionnaire items were suggested at workshops of rank and file and union officials who were asked to describe a commited union person. What did he/she believe in? What did he/she feel? What did he/she do? A second source of items was the psychological literature that deals with commitment to the employing organization. What binds an individual to an IBM, a General Electric, or a Westinghouse? Questionnaire items from these studies were transposed so that they were meaningful for research on union commitment. Lastly, we conducted a pilot study with a first draft of the questionnaire. The results of this small study involving about 70 rank and file from an industrial union suggested additional items.

---

[2] Hamner, W.C., and Smith, F.J. Work attitudes as predictors of unionization activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1978, *63*, 415-421.

The sample that was the basis for the findings I will shortly report included approximately 1400 members of 4 locals of an international union. All the locals were affiliated with one international and all dealt with the same employer. These people were largely white-collar, semi-professional employees, but the locals were atypical (e.g., these locals didn't have the right to strike). While not the mainstream of American labor, this was the only union that supported our efforts after two years of searching.

Our first goal was to define commitment in a way that researchers could use it. For researchers to use a concept, they have to be able to measure it. Therefore, our initial objective was to measure the concept of union commitment. Since it is not some physical object on which you can place a ruler, special techniques must be employed to measure commitment. We used a technique called "factor analysis" in order to identify the measurable aspects of union commitment. I am not going to explain the technique, but maybe I can draw an analogy regarding its use. Like commitment, baseball pitching is a concept. Once can talk about specific pitchers such as Koufax, Maglie and Guidry, just like you can talk about individual commited members. But, you can also discuss pitching from the more general standpoint of its various facets. You can talk about control. You can talk about 'stuff,' You can talk about speed. These are the facets, the different aspects of pitching. Having defined these aspects of pitching, any particular pitcher then may be evaluated in terms of these pitching facets. Factor analysis enabled us to define appropriate facets of union commitment characteristics of any particular member.

Union commitment seemed to have four facets -- four characteristics, four aspects. The first of the facets of union commitment was Union Loyalty. This has been defined as a sense of pride in one's association with the union. However, this aspect also contains the ideas of instrumentality. That is, what is it that the union can do for me? What do I get for my dues and from membership in this organization? A person who scores high on Union Loyalty is one who has expressed pride in membership in the organization and in the record of what the union local has accomplished. But, he/she is also someone who is aware of the benefits that are to be gained as an individual member of that union. One of the most important items read, "Joining this union was a smart move on my part." This is clearly the most important of the facets. To those of you conversant with statistics, this facet accounts for the most common variance in commitment.

The next two facets are participative characteristics, both of which concern working for the union. Responsibility Toward the Union represents involvement in union affairs with rather low personal cost to the individual. This refers simply to doing the kinds of things on a day to day basis that you would expect of a union member. In more technical jargon, a member who scores high on this facet is a person who has recognized and accepted union expectations regarding his/her support of and reliance upon negotiated mechanisms for dealing with management. Therefore, you know what is in the contract if you are high on this dimension. You pay attention to the union label. You are willing to see that management lives up to the contract. You keep your ears open for information that might be of use to the union. You help others who are interested in filing a grievance and you, yourself, are willing to file a grievance. These are the kinds of behavior that define this second facet.

The third facet of commitment is Willingness to Work for the Union. This facet typically involved higher personal costs to the member than the previous participative aspect of commitment. A member who scores high on this facet has expressed a readiness to go above and beyond the call of duty in behalf of the union. For example, he/she has stated a willingness to serve on union committees or run for an elected union office.

The fourth facet is Belief in Unionism. This aspect of commitment represents the closeness with which the member is bound to the concept of unions and the ideals of organized labor in general. Members who score high on this facet are people who endorse the values of organized labor. Their loyalty is to the union and not necessarily to the work. They reject the idea that their work comes ahead of the union. What is important about this last facet is that it only appears when you are looking at older, longer tenured union members. Belief in Unionism could not be defined statistically among younger union members. In other words, this aspect of commitment could not be identified by means of factor analysis when only the data of younger respondents were examined.

Those are the four facets of union commitment. (Relying once more on the baseball analogy, these aspects correspond to being able to throw an aspirin tablet, or to having a lot of stuff, or to being a control pitcher.) One more thing requires comment. These facets are independent. This means that there is no reason to expect a person who scores high on Union Loyalty, for example, to necessarily score high on any of the other aspects of union commitment.

Next, effort was devoted to identifying the correlates of these facets of commitment. In essence, our purpose was to determine the characteristics of members who score high or low on measures of these commitment aspects. Specifically, it was our intention to examine each facet of commitment in relation to the member's satisfaction with his/her job, satisfaction with the union, attitudes about unions, participation in union affairs, and socialization experiences. There may be some lessons here that apply to methods of running a union local.

To begin, early socialization experiences were closely associated with member commitment. How people were treated during the first year in the union was highly related to their current level of commitment. In particular, people who reported that they felt pressured to join the union (recall that the study was performed in right-to-work states) typically had low scores on union loyalty. Mr. Schrank's remark that white collar workers do not want to hear tough talk supports this empirical finding of ours. By contrast, high union loyalty was characteristic among those individuals who were personally invited to a local meeting or who received help from another member in filing a grievance during the first year in the union. Taking steps to increase the involvement of new members in union activities is a plan worth considering, especially in view of the policy in some locals which prevents rank and file from participating on committees or holding elected office for five years after initiation.

Recent socialization influences are also important. The social climate as defined by the attitudes of friends and co-workers toward the union are closely related to member commitment.

Another set of findings concerned the relationship between satisfaction with the union and the four commitment facets. Union loyalty was associated with the level of satisfaction expressed about the local. Satisfaction with the union was unrelated to the other three commitment facets. In other words, happy union members are loyal union members although they are not inclined to work for the union nor are they more devoted to the ideals of organized labor.

Attitudes toward the union were measured with a scale developed at the University of Minnesota.[3] Of the various specific attitudes measured with this scale, only attitudes toward the concept of organized labor was related to all of the commitment facets. The implication of this is obvious - sell the idea of organized labor. Sell the concept if you are interested in getting high commitment.

The participative factors -- Responsibility Toward the Union and Willingness to Work for the Union -- were inversely related to the economic and non-economic satisfactions provided by the job. If people are unhappy with the pay, then they are going to start getting active in the union. If they are unhappy with the challenge in their job, they are going to start getting active in the union.

Participation in union affairs and union commitment are different. We found, for example, that males went to more meetings, held union office, and worked on committees more often than women. However, women had higher loyalty. (Of course, this makes sense. We all know that working women have two jobs -- one at home and one in the factory or the office.) The point is, don't assess the loyalty of your troops by simply counting noses at union meetings. That is not a good index of whether or not your membership is loyal. You must measure commitment directly.

In closing, allow me to suggest that these findings are but the first tentative step in constructing a body of knowledge which can be of use to unions. And, it seems to me that unions are particularly hard pressed in these times. Despite the fact that there is a Democratic Congress and a Democrat in the White House, it hasn't helped much in passing legislation favorable to unions such as the Common Situs bill. Similarly, the term industrial democracy now has come to mean job enrichment, not the quasi-legal grievance mechanism fought for and used by unions to defend an individual's contractual rights against capricious management decisions. Finally, the tenor of our times is individuation - "doing your own thing" as opposed to the collective action. I have to take issue with something mentioned by one of yesterday's speakers. While commenting about Mr. Schrank's book, the speaker indicated his pleasure that it did not contain even a single standard deviation. Well, for your information, a standard deviation is a measure of individual differences - a statistic representing variability. I think it is clearly to your advantage to pay greater attention to this statistic in this day and age. Reliance upon a science such as psychology would be advantageous to you since standard deviations and individual differences are the psychologist's bread and butter. Perhaps we can help you sort through the variability and find some way to transform this variability among rank and file into an inventory of human resources both broad and deep.

---

[3] Uphoff, W.H. and Dunnette, M.D. Understanding the union member. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Thank you for your attention.

Stuart Schmidt, Associate Professor of
Industrial Relations and Organizational Behavior
Temple University

Examining the Steward's Role

My colleagues and I at the Center for Labor and Human Resource Studies, Temple University are studying the role of stewards in a number of large locals. On the basis of this work and my personal experiences as a steward, I will present you with a way of looking at the steward's job. This is an application of socio-pyschological role analysis to the steward's job. This approach is useful in selecting, training and evaluating stewards. Additionally we find that many locals have communication problems with their stewards. We believe that a role analysis of the steward's position is helpful in understanding these problems.

The steward is a person in the "middle." There are three primary groups of people who have expectations of stewards and hence may pressure them. These are the employer, union officers and the rank and file. In turn, stewards must respond to pressures from these groups.

Employers expect a steward to be both a "good," loyal employee and a union advocate. Principally, employers expect stewards to understand the employers'concerns with production staffing and so forth.

Union officers have another set of expectations for stewards. Stewards are suppose to be an advocate for unionism in the shop. Furthermore, stewards are expected to communicate local policies, directives and decisions to the rank and file. Additionally stewards are expected to police the contract and be a militant defender of the local.

The rank and file expect stewards to solve day-to-day problems and be the voice of dissent to union officers. Often for the rank and file, the steward is the primary contact with the union. Indeed, for many rank and filers the steward is the union.

Often the expectations which employers, union officers and rank and file have for a steward are incompatible. These expectations are communicated to stewards in many ways. Thus it is necessary to understand the nature of these communications. Who is doing the communicating? What is their influence? If a steward is up for election, the rank and file may be very influential. At another time, a steward may pay more attention to the local officers if the steward has career aspirations within the union and is courting official favor.

Stewards receive communications and interpret them from the employer, union officers and the rank and file. A steward's interpretation of the communications may be at odds with what the groups were communicating to the steward. The steward's interpretation is influenced by his or her ambitions, experiences and views. These influences determine how a specific steward may interpret communications.

The employers, union officers and the rank and file evaluate a steward according to whether he or she is acting in a way which is congruent with their expectations. This is the "congruence test." If the steward's actions are not congruent with the expectations of the people holding them, they criticize the steward.

Stewards experience stress in trying to satisfy the often incompatible expectations of the employer, union officers, and the rank and file. For instance, the rank and file may be satisfied but the officers are unsatisfied with the stewards' actions. Many stewards leave their positions (resign or not run for re-election) because they cannot handle the stress. These stewards report that there is just too much criticism; everyone is mad; and no one is happy. They feel that they cannot do all that is expected of them. One area of stress is the conflict between being a good employee, meeting employer expectations and being an advocate for the union.

Stewards also experience stress in performing all of the mandated steward functions. This occurs when a steward is expected to voice the local officers' position to the rank and file and be a rank and file spokesperson to the local leadership. As in this situation, the expectations for a steward are incompatible and cannot be met. In turn, the steward is criticized by both the union officers and rank and file. The steward responds by saying, "What's the use?" and gives up.

What is the utility for a role analysis of the steward's job? This approach helps us determine who has expectations of the steward; who has influence; and the types of pressures on the steward. Also we can look at the degree of congruence between the stewards actions and rank and file, employer and local officers expectations. Thus the afore mentioned role analysis has several applications to the administrative functions in a local.

(1) Choosing Stewards. Potential stewards need to be not only intelligent, articulate, committed, but also have the personality and ability to deal with criticism. They need strong egos such

that they will not be devasted by the criticism and stress inherent in the steward's job.

(2) Training Stewards. Much steward training has evolved around "tools" courses -- understanding the contract, writing up grievances and so forth. However, there is a need for more of a personal development component in training. This training would prepare stewards for the pressures and stress of the job. New stewards could be made aware of the variety of role conflicts that they will be experiencing and how to deal with them.

We find that most steward training is informal, on-the-job. Perhaps, unions could provide more structure to the on-the-job training. New stewards could meet periodically with former or current stewards in training/discussion sessions.

(3) Communicating with Stewards. Union officers should be aware of the need for effective communications with stewards. Stewards are one of the primary means of communication between the rank and file and union officers. Perhaps more formal mechanisms would be useful for this communication. These might involve steward councils, greater steward representation on executive boards, etc... It is important that stewards are able to communicate easily up, down and throughout the local.

(4) Evaluating Stewards. Often stewards are evaluated without considering the trials, tribulations, stresses and conflicts that are part of the job and affect performance. Perhaps, as a result of a role analysis of the position, steward evaluations can be made more realistic.

This brief presentation is an example of how psychology and social psychology can be useful to those attempting to improve the functioning of union locals.

A. Michael Collins,
Education and Training,
International Union of Operating Engineers

Consultants and Unions

I would like to suggest that there are two main kinds of interaction that we are talking about when we discuss unions and psychologists working together. I am going to tell you a little of the experiences that we have had at the International Union of Operating Engineers.

The first kind of interaction is to let psychologists study you. That is what we have heard about this morning. Now, there is some peril in that activity. There are three main kinds of problems that I can see. One is that they may not be committed to your values and may undercut what the union is trying to do. This is an important problem that has been brought up already. I am going to return to it later. The second problem is that the psychologists may stir up trouble in areas that you thought were going nice and smoothly. Now, that is our problem really, not their problem, and it is something we have to deal with. The third problem is that they will need educating. There will be costs to people who work with them. You will have to spend time with these people, who never know as much as they think they do about how unions work. They will need help getting established. Those are all costs.

But, there are some leads we can get from them too. I think we can learn a lot from the studies that can be done. There are things that need to be done, and the projects we have heard about this morning are a good start. We can learn a lot, that, if psychologists will address our agenda of concerns; that is the paramount question. Will their studies be relevant to the goals that we are trying to achieve as union people?

I want to stress another kind of interaction with psychologists purchasing services from them. That is what I have been involved with. Now, there are two ways the International Union of Operating Engineers has worked with psychologists as consultants. First, a project that has been going on for some three years now in our union is called the "Training Standards Project." We have used psychologists as consultants in our apprenticeship and training programs. We have used them for job analysis, to help us in our affirmative action program design, to create and prove the fairness of training tasks and selection procedures that we have been developing, and to help us in curriculum design, providing the foundation of new curriculum in our training programs. We have been working with a psychologists named Sidney Fine who lives here in Washington. This has been a very successful program from our point of view, and we are very happy with it. Many of our local people have gained a lot of training and understanding, our local training personnel are very happy with the program, and I feel it has helped them a lot in their job.

Now, why is this program a success? It is because in the beginning of the program we decided that we had to avoid the great pitfall of using consultants, which is that of the medical model. Consultants like to act like doctors. You hire someone to come in, he pokes you all over, gives you a prescription and his bill, and leaves. You are not really any smarter than you were in the beginning. Well, we were very careful to make sure that the things we wanted to learn were things that we would find out and would know at the end. We were determined that there would be a real transfer of the technology that we were buying. We brought 25 of our local training people here to the Labor Studies Center in 1976, taught them in a week's course a method of job analysis, and made them the job analysts. They knew the job, they just needed to learn the techniques of expression. We wanted to improve our training programs. We knew that if we had an outsider come in and try to tell our people how to do their jobs, the project would not get very far.

So, we had to bring our people along with the project. Really, it is their knowledge that counts. It is not the psychologist's knowledge. Our people are very happy with the program. It is the best thing that has happened in our training program, because our training personnel learned new methods they could apply themselves. Although building trades unions are unusual by being more or less in charge of job training programs for our new members. I would suggest as well that the kind of training standards and curriculum development program we undertook could be applied very successfully to union staff positions in other areas. We are trying to do that now and, of course, political problems are there, as in any other organization, but we are moving in the right direction ourselves.

In the project I just described, our consultants helped us focus on the work we do, how it is organized and how best to arrange the content of training. In another project, we worked with consultants who helped us focus on the methodology of teaching adults. This is an area in which I feel most unions have a lot to learn; I know we learned a lot. Once again, we were careful to emphasize our desire to master the techniques used by our consultants, in order to apply them independently in the future.

There are a couple of lessons I would like to share with you, as well as some problems. The lessons were, first that we could use psychologists and work with them very successfully. Just as in working with lawyers and other professionals, there is a need not to let them make their work too mysterious.

Another big question we had is how do you separate the wheat from the chaff in choosing consultants. We need consumer feedback. When we began our project we had no idea how to find someone who was sympathetic to union goals, who would train our people to do the job and would work with us. We took about a year to find someone that we were willing to take a chance on.

Two things need to happen to help us better use psychologists. First, and this is going to happen, there is a group of us who are going to the convention of the American Psychological Association (APA) this year, and we are going to preach the gospel. We are going to have a session where we will try then to tell them what labor people want and expect.

Second, we have to pool our information better than we have in the past. We had a meeting between some people in psychology and some union people, and we each knew of some things that were going on -- a project here and a project there -- but no one knew about all of them. We need to get this information together, and for those of us who may be interested in working with psychologists, we need to have some way of finding the right person for our projects. Similarly, we need to get information on those who come to us, in order to find out what their commitments are. It is fair for us to test these people's commitment and their values concerning unions. It is important that we do it and we are going to be very up-front about that to them. Psychology is not "value-free," and at this moment there is no reason to believe that labor's values are widely shared by industrial/organizational psychologists.

In summary, times seem to be changing somewhat in industrial psychology. Some psychologists have discovered that they share the values of the labor movement; others are simply seeking new markets. For whichever reasons the labor movement is being "rediscovered." Perhaps we are only just getting sophisticated enough to appreciate what psychology can do for us. I think we can learn from these changing times and we can encourage the changes that will help us. It is an area that we can't afford to overlook.

Theodore V. Purcell, S.J.
Research Professor,
Jesuit Center for Social Studies,
Georgetown University

Psychological Research in Union-Management Relations

I have a paper here called "The Role of Psychological Research in Union-Management Relations." It will be published later this year. I would like to give you some highlights from that paper.

Let us look back at some history for a moment. This will give some idea of where psychological research in union-management relations might possibly go in the future. After World War II, people were asking why more and more workers were beginning to join unions. So they asked psychologists to tell them something about that. Also back in the fifties, psychologist Arthur Kornhauser did a study for the UAW about the UAW's politics.

In addition, there were a few psychologists working in the area of workers' dual allegiance to company and union. I did two books studying the dual allegiances of packing house workers in the former UPWA and in the AMC&BW. A word about dual allegiance. I found that dual allegiance in most of the mass production industries was probably the rule rather than the exception at least for hourly-paid employees. Not all, but some persons occupying official roles within either organization tended to have unilateral allegiance. The dual allegiance concept and findings continue to have something to say today, in my opinion, both to non-union companies like IBM or Xerox or especially to J. P. Stevens and also to the trade union movement.

Now let us look at union-management relations in terms of their direct, institutional relationships; collective bargaining, arbitration, mediation, and conciliation. Rarely are psychologists directly involved as participants or consultants in these areas. In the coal strike of a few years ago, for example, there were lawyers and economists involved but no psychologists. Yet some of the issues definitely involved the things that psychology is familiar with, such as the perception and motivation of both sides.

Now, consider union-management relations in terms of their indirect, functional relationships; such areas as the quality of working life, selection and promotion procedures, interpersonal relations, leadership and training, etc. In this area psychologists, through their research and consulting, have definitely made contributions.

For example, the quality of working life. Former Labor Secretary John Dunlop, in his recent book on labor relations, has this to say: "Unions could reap enormous advantages should they begin to interest themselves in the enrichment of work." I think Dunlop is right. The UAW has been active in this area. UAW Vice President Bluestone recently had an article in the National Labor Review about what the UAW has been doing with Harmon International in Tennessee and in other places.

Then there is the selection and promotion of employees. Because of recent stress on fairness for minorities and women, psychologists have had much to say about selection procedures that is valuable not only for management but for unions. For example, the American Psychological Association has been effective in trying to work out improvements for the EEOC guidelines for selection promotions. It is a very complex area, but one in which the research skills of psychologists can be useful for the union movement.

Then, of course, there is steward training and rank and file education. I shall not say much about that, because other members of the panel are treating it. Psychologists have something to contribute here.

I should now say something about a very small minority of psychologists who are known as union busters: people like Charles Hughes, formerly of Texas Instruments, who goes around the country as a consultant showing how management can keep unions out. People like Hughes do not help the public relations of psychologists with the union movement. But they are definitely in the minority.

Notwithstanding, the study psychologists have made of union-management relations and the fact that some psychologists do part-time consulting work for unions, I found that in 1972, while 789 of the 27,371 members of the APA were employed by business, not one was employed by a union. Neither by training nor by experience do many psychologists come in touch with the union movement.

We are trying to correct that because we think that psychologists have something to say that can be useful to the unions as well as to management. The basic human problems of psychological perception and motivation are crucial in union-management relations, both at the institutional level and at the daily functional level in the plant. Indeed, relations between the rank and file and upper top union officers also involve perception and motivation, and psychological research can help make those relationships more satisfying.

Another functional area of union-management relations wherein psychologists can make a contribution is the interpersonal relations between employee union members in the plant. If I may talk about my own work, for many years I have been studying Black-White relations at work. Much of this research was published in 1973 in a book called Blacks in the Industrial World. In this work we had the support of unions such as the IUE, the UE, the Sheet Metal Workers and the UAW, as well as management. Without this bilateral approach, I don't think we could have gotten the honest feelings of both management and union people.

Among other things, we discussed what the IUE could do for better Black-White relations through its locals and what stewards were doing to get the races to work together. Both the unions and managements involved were interested in our findings and were able to utilize them. We concluded that when Blacks advanced in the industrial world, they can enrich that world for Whites as well as for Blacks.

Psychologists also can work to improve communication, leadership styles, membership morale and so forth within the union organization itself.

I conclude that in direct institutional relations between unions and managements, it is more difficult to bring in psychologists but nevertheless the kind of things psychologists deal with could make them important for these relationships.

In indirect functional relationships, psychology will continue to play an important role. In doing so, it will not be its function to try to eliminate industrial conflict. Progress in human social welfare can hardly be had without conflict, but applications of psychological insights can help make those conflicts constructive.

It has been a pleasure to bring to your attention some research areas wherein psychologists could be helpful to the union movement. Thank you.

APPENDIX

1979 ANNUAL AFL-CIO EDUCATION CONFERENCE
GEORGE MEANY CENTER FOR LABOR STUDIES
March 18-21, 1979

Sunday, March 18

4:00 - 6:00 p.m.	REGISTRATION
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	DINNER IN CAFETERIA
7:00 - 7:15 p.m.	Welcome - Fred Hoehler
7:15 - 7:30 p.m.	Remarks - Walter G. Davis
7:30 - 7:45 p.m.	Orientation - Ed Czarnecki
7:45 - 8:30 p.m.	Education Legislative Update - Dorothy Shields
8:30 p.m.	RECEPTION

Monday, March 19

8:00 - 9:15 a.m.	BREAKFAST AND REGISTRATION
9:15 - 10:15 a.m.	CHAIRPERSON: WALTER G. DAVIS Keynote Address Role of Educators in Organizing Training Alan Kistler, Director, Department of Organization and Field Services, AFL-CIO
10:15 - 10:30 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK
10:30 - Noon	CHAIRPERSON: ED CZARNECKI Panel describing specific organizing training programs Panelists: Bill Roehl, Department of Organization, AFL-CIO Jack Adams, RCIU Bruce Raynor, ACTWU Saul Nesselroth, University of Connecticut Norm Eiger, Rutgers
Noon - 1:15 p.m.	LUNCH IN CAFETERIA
1:15 - 2:45 p.m.	Panel: Response to Union Busting "Educational Conferences" Chairpersons: Charles McDonald Department of Organization, AFL-CIO Panelists: Bob Muehlenkamp, Local 1199, RWDSU Al Bilik, IUE Harold McIver, IUD

2:45 - 3:00 p.m.	COFFEE/COKE BREAK
3:00 - 4:30 p.m.	CHAIRPERSON: BILL LANXNER Panel: Analysis of Successful Missouri Campaign to Defeat Right-To-Work -- Its Implications For Educators Panelists: Allan Zack, Public Relations Department, AFL-CIO Walter Davis, RCIU Mary Elkuss, ACTWU
4:30 - 6:00 p.m.	EDUCATION EXHIBITS
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	DINNER IN CAFETERIA
7:00 - 7:30 p.m.	CHAIRPERSON: WALTER G. DAVIS Karen Chaikin, Coordinator, American Histadrut Cultural Exchange Institute
7:30 - 8:30 p.m.	Presentation by Al Shanker, President, AFT
8:30 p.m.	RECEPTION

Tuesday, March 20

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	CHAIRPERSON: WALTER G. DAVIS COPE Checkoff Campaign: Al Barkan, Director AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education
10:00 - 10:15 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK
10:15 - 11:15 a.m.	CHAIRPERSON: ED CZARNECKI Presentation on Humanization of Workplace Bob Schrank, Ford Foundation Author of "10,000 Working Days"
11:15 - Noon	Remarks on Humanization and Quality of Work Projects Patsy L. Fryman, CWA Paul Rosenstein, AFSCME
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH IN CAFETERIA
1:00 - 1:30 p.m.	CHAIRPERSON: WALTER G. DAVIS Report on National Football League Players Association Summer Camps: Ed Garvey and Brigg Owens

1:30 - 2:45 p.m.	CHAIRPERSON: JACKIE KIENZLE Report on Study of Women and Trade Unions in Four European Countries Val Lorwin and Roberta Till-Retz, University of Oregon
2:45 - 3:00 p.m.	COFFEE/COKE BREAK
3:00 - 4:30 p.m.	4 Workshops on Promoting Equality through: (1) Collective Bargaining, Gloria Johnson, IUE (2) Training Women for Leadership, Anne Nelson, Cornell University (3) Adapting Union Structure and Activities, Marge Rachlin, George Meany Labor Studies Center (4) Health and Safety Programs, George O'Connell, University of Connecticut
4:30 - 6:00 p.m.	Education Exhibits
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	DINNER IN CAFETERIA
8:00 p.m.	CHAIRPERSON: GENE MORRILL, Coordinator, Arts Program, George Meany Labor Studies Center AN EVENING OF JAZZ

Wednesday, March 21

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	CHAIRPERSON: JACKIE KIENZLE Report on Workshops
9:00 - 9:45 a.m.	CHAIRPERSON: DOROTHY SHIELDS Unions and the Humanities/Arts Connie Kopelov, RWDSU 1199, Bread & Roses Program Len Oliver, National Endowment for the Humanities and Ann Clark , National Endowment for the Arts
9:45 - 10:00 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK
10:00 - 10:40 a.m.	CHAIRPERSON: JOHN ZALUSKY Psychological Research into "Characteristics of Committed Union Members" Michael E. Gordon, University of Tennessee
10:40 - 11:20 a.m.	Psychological Studies on "Role of the Shop Steward" Stuart Schmidt, Temple University
11:20 - Noon	Remarks: Mike Collins, IUOE and Ted Purcell, Georgetown Uni ADJOURN
Noon	LUNCH IN CAFETERIA

PARTICIPANTS

ANNUAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

March 18 - 21, 1979

William Abbott
Director
Labor Center, AACJC
1 DuPont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ron Abshire
Ctr. for Labor Ed. & Res.
University of Kentucky
643 Maxwelton Court
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

John Adams
Asst. to Intl. Dir. of Org.
Retail Clerks Intl. Union
1775 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dr. John Aiken
Buffalo State College
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14222

Casper J. Alessi, Jr.
Staff Representative
Indiana State AFL-CIO
1000 N. Madison
Greenwood, Indiana 46142

David Alexander
Project Coordinator
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University
Ryders Lane & Clifton Ave.
New Brunswick, N. J. 08903

Shimon Avizemer
Histadrut Rep. to U.S. & Canada
American Histadrut Cultural
Exchange Institute
33 E. 67th Street
New York, New York 10021

Vaughn Ball, Director
Research and Education
kery, Confec. & Tobacco Wkrs.
1828 L Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Douglas J. Bantle
Labor Relations
NYSSILR, Cornell Univ.
120 Franklin Street
Rochester, New York 14604

Al Barkan, Director
Comm. on Political Ed. AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Duane Beeler, Instructor
Labor Education Division
Roosevelt University
430 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Ill. 60605

Mark Belkin, Instructor
School of Labor Indust. Rel.
Michigan State University
South Kedzie Hall, Rm. 418
E. Lansing, Michigan 48824

Al Bilik
Intl. Union of Elec. Wkrs.
1126 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Anne Bingham
Assistant Editor
Allied Industrial Wkrs.
3520 West Oklahoma Ave.
Milwaukee, Wisc. 53215

David S. Blitzstein, Analyst
Retail Clerks Intl. Union
1775 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

William H. Bork, Director
Labor Education Division
Roosevelt University
430 S. Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60605

George Boyle, Director
Labor Education Program
University of Missouri
1004 Elm Street
Columbia, Mo. 65211

Clayola Brown
Field Representative
ACTWU, Education Dept.
770 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

Alan Browning
Merritt College
12500 Campus Drive
Oakland, Calif. 94619

Frank Burger
Director of Education
United Paperworkers
163-03 Horace Harding Expwy.
Flushing, New York 11365

Barry Burrows
Committee of Urban Program Univ.
1300 19th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C.

George Butsika
Director of Education
United Steelworkers of America
5 Gateway Center
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222

Karen Chaikin, Coordinator
American Histadrut Cultural
  Exchange Institute
33 E. 67th Street
New York, New York 10021

Ann Clark
Natl. Endow. for the Arts
2401 E Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Paul Clark
Labor Education Specialist
NYSSILR, Cornell Univ.
P. O. Box 1000
Ithaca, New York 14853

Yvonne Coleman
Intl. Representative
IBEW
1125 15th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Michael Collins
Intl. Union of Oper. Eng.
1125 17th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

George Daitsman
Education Director
Allied Industrial Workers
3520 W. Oklahoma Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisc. 53215

Walter L. Davis
Retail Clerks Intl. Union
1775 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Ros Denaci
ACTWU
770 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

Joel Denker
University of D. C.
Labor Studies Center
724 9th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C.

John Taylor Dennis
President
Responsibility Language Systems, Inc.
230 Houston St., N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia

Bernie Dinkin, Educ. Director
ACTWU Philadelphia Joint Board
2113-29 South Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19146

Robert Douglas, Assoc. Dir.
Research and Education
BRAC
3 Research Place
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Richard E. Dwyer, Dean
Center for Labor Studies
Empire State College, SUNY
326 W. 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Norman Eiger, Assoc. Director
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University
Ryders Lane & Clifton Ave.
New Brunswick, N. J. 08903

David Eisen
The Newspaper Guild
1125 15th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Mary Elkuss, Educ. Dir.
ACTWU S. W. Regional Joint Board
1627 Locust
St. Louis, Mo. 63103

William Elkuss
Education Director
ACTWU
770 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

Mary Feldblum
Assistant Professor
Hofstra University
Dist. #65, Distrib.Wkrs.of America
13 Astor Place
New York, N. Y. 10003

Ron Field
A.A.S.C.U.
1 DuPont Circle, N. W.
Suite 700
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dr. Morris Fried, Director
Labor Studies Program
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Harvey Friedman, Director
Labor Relations & Research
University of Massachusetts
125 Draper Hall
Amherst, Mass. 01003

Patsy Fryman
Comm. Workers of America
1925 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Ken Gagala
Labor Studies Coordinator
Cornell University
17-2B Lansing, North
Ithaca, New York 14850

Ed Garvey, Director
Natl. Football League
Players Association
1300 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Sondra Gash
Training Advisor
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University
Ryders Lane & Clifton Ave.
New Brunswick, N.J. 08903

Fr. Mortimer H. Gavin, SJ
Dir., Inst. of Indust. Relations
Archdiocese of Boston
761 Harrison Avenue
Boston, Mass. 02118

Robin Gerber
Cornell University
112 State Street
Albany, New York 12207

Greg Giebel
Labor Studies Dept.
Penn State Univ.
Radnor Grad. Center
Radnor, Pa. 19087

Gerry Glyde
Dept. of Labor Studies
Penn State Univ.
901 Liberal Arts Tower
Univ. Park, Pa. 16802

Lynn Goldfarb
Women's Labor History Film Project
1213 Island Drive
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48105

Michael Gordon
Dept. of Management
College of Business Admin.
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tenn. 37916

Anne C. Green
Director of Res. & Educ.
ICWU
1655 W. Market Street
Akron, Ohio 44313

Reese Hammond
Director of Education
Intl. Union of Oper. Eng.
1125 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

John R. Hanson
Acting Dir. of Labor Educ.
University of Maine
128 College Avenue
Orono, Maine 04473

Robert Harbrant
Secretary-Treasurer
Food & Beverage Trades Dept.
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Leon Harris
Education Director
RWDSU
101 W. 31st Street
New York, N. Y. 10001

Jim Harrison
Comm. of Urban Program Univ.
1300 19th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Arthur Hartmann
Special Asst. to the President
Retail Clerks Intl. Union
1775 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Chuck Higgins
Education Dept.
IAM
1300 Conn. Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Wayne Horman
Research & Education
OCAW
1636 Champa Street
Denver, Colo. 80201

Craig Hudson, Economist
Office of Trade Adjust. Asst.
Dept. of Labor, Rm. N5459
200 Constitution Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20210

Robert E. Hull
Natl. Project Coord.
Laborers' Training Program
Laborers' Intl. Union
Box 131 - M.S. Route 2
Coatesville, Indiana 46121

Anatoli Ilyashow
Instructor
✓ Wayne State University
2 College of Lifelong Learning
Detroit, Michigan

Harold Jenkins
Education Director
United Rubber Workers
87 South High Street
Akron, Ohio 44308

Gloria Johnson, Director
Educ. & Women's Activities
Intl. Union of Electrical Wkrs
1126 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Arthur Kane
Intl. Bro. of Teamsters
25 Louisiana Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20001

George Kanyok
Asst. Dir. of Education
Amalgamated Meat Cutters
2800 Sheridan Rd., North
Chicago, Ill. 60657

Tziporah Kasachkoff
Manhattan Community College
1633 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10019

Stuart Kaufman
Assoc. Professor
U. of Md., Dept. of History
College Park, Md. 20742

Dora Kelenson
Librarian
AFL-CIO
815 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Don Kennedy
Univ. of Pennsylvania
Dept. of Labor Studies
P. O. Box 2150, RD #5
Tupehocken Road
Reading, Pa. 19608

Roy Kirkley
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University
Ryders Lane & Clifton Ave.
New Brunswick, N. J. 08903

Alan Kistler, Director
Dept. of Organ. & Field Services
AFL-CIO
815 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dutch Kleywegt
Labor Studies Coordinator
Des Moines Area Comm. College
Urban Campus
5th and College
Des Moines, Iowa 50315

Rich Klimmer
National Representative
American Fed. of Teachers
11 DuPont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Jules Kolodny, Chairman
Labor Education Comm.
United Fed. of Teachers
260 Park Avenue, South
New York, N. Y. 10010

Connie Kopelov
Education Director
Natl. Union of Hosp. Wkrs., #1199
310 West 43rd Street
New York, N. Y. 10003

Karen Koziara
Temple University
1945 Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

John Kulstad
Hdqtrs.Staff Training
C.W.A.
1925 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Charles Lamb
Director of Education
HR & BIU Local #2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, Calif. 94102

Alan Lee
Education Director
Amal. Meat Cutters
2800 N. Sheridan Rd.
Chicago, Ill. 60657

Edgar Lee
Asst. Dir. of Education
AFSCME
1625 L St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

David LeGrande
OSHA Administrator
CWA
1925 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Richard Leone, Director
Labor & Human Resource Studies
Temple University
1945 Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

Herbert Levine, Director
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University
Ryders Lane & Clifton Ave.
New Brunswick, N. J. 08903

Milferd Lieberthal
Project Coordinator
Labor Education Center
Rutgers University
Ryders Lane & Clifton Ave.
New Brunswick, N.J. 08903

William Lindner
Exec. Vice President
Transport Workers Union
1980 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10023

Mr. Val Lorwin
University of Oregon
Dept. of History
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Margaret Lynch
Special Representative
Intl. Assoc. of Machinists
6500 Pearl Rd., Suite 60
Cleveland, Ohio 44130

Thomas J. Mackell, Jr.
Administrator, District #2
Marine Engineers Ben. Assoc.
635 Fourth Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11232

Collyn W. Maple
Grand Lodge Rep.
IAM
50 W. Oakton Street
Des Plaines, Ill. 60018

Art Maxwell
U.S. Dept. of Treasury
20th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Charles McDonald
Dept. of Organ. & Field Services
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Harold McIver
Director of Organization
I.U.D.
5105 Monroe Road
P. O. Box 18245
Charlotte, N. C. 28218

Daniel J. McVey
Secretary-Treasurer
Missouri State Labor Council
208 Madison
Jefferson City, Mo. 65101

Jack Mezirow
Professor of Adult Educ.
Teachers College
Columbia University
525 W. 120th Street
New York, N. Y. 10027

Everett G. Miller, Sr.
Coord. in Labor Studies
Dundalk Community College
7200 Sollers Point Road
Dundalk, Md. 21222

Nitza J. Miranda, Coordinator
Workers Education Program
Labor Inst. of the U. of Puerto Rico
Box BH, U.P.R. Station
Rio Piedras, P. R. 00931

Donna Mobley
Education Rep.
ACTWU
770 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

Bob Muehlenkamp
RWDSU & 1199
310 W. 43rd Street
New York, N. Y. 10003

Deborah Nagin, Assoc. Dir.
Occup. Safety Health
Cornell Univ. NYSSILR
3 E. 43rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

Anne Nelson
Assoc. Dir. Women's Inst.
Cornell Univ. NYSSILR
7 East 43rd Street
New York, N. Y. 10017

Saul Nesselroth
Assoc. Professor
Labor Education Center
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Conn. 06268

Roy Ockert, Coordinator
Research and Education
Intl. Woodworkers of America
1622 N. Lombard Street
Portland, Oregon 97217

George E. O'Connell, Dir.
Labor Education Center
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Conn. 06268

Len Oliver
Natl. Endow. for the Humanities
806 15th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20506

Brigg Owens
Natl.Football League
Players Association
1300 Connecticut Ave.,N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Marrion A. Parsons
National Director
Laborers' Training Program
Laborers' Intl. Union
905 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Thomas Patka
Center for Labor
Fla. Intl. University
Tamiami Trail
Miami, Fla. 33199

Sally Payne
Intl. Bro. of Teamsters
25 Louisiana Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

Jasper Peyton
Asst. Dir. of Education
ILGWU
1710 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10019

Sylvia Pines, Director
Dist. #65, Dist. Workers
Hofstra University
13 Astor Place
New York, N. Y. 10003

Mary Jean Piraino
Field Representative
Amal. Meat Cutters
2800 N. Sheridan Rd.
Chicago, Ill. 60657

Glenn Plummer
Field Representative
Amal. Meat Cutters
2800 N. Sheridan Rd.
Chicago, Ill. 60657

David Prather
Legislative Chrmn.
CWA #204
279 Logan St., S.E.
Atlanta, Ga. 30312

Ray M. Pudliner
Director of Education
Upholsterers' Intl. Union
25 N. 4th Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19106

Fr. Ted Purcell
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C. 20057

Marge Rachlin
G.M. Ctr. for Labor Studies
10000 New Hampshire Ave.
Silver Spring, Md. 20903

Patricia Rains
Organizer
ILGWU
1233 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio

Bruce Raynor
Assoc. Educ. Director
ACTWU
770 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

John Remington, Director
Center for Labor
Fla. Intl. University
Tamiami Trail
Miami, Fla. 33199

Barbara Robinson
International Rep.
I.A.T.S.E.
1515 Broadway, Suite 601
New York, New York 10036

Bill Roehl, Staff Rep.
Dept. of Organ. & Field Services
AFL-CIO
815 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Frieda Rosen
Instr. of Labor Studies
Penn State University
901 Liberal Arts Tower
Univ. Park, Pa. 16802

Stan Rosen, Coordinator
Labor Education Program
Inst. of Labor & Ind. Rel.
University of Illinois
P. O. Box 4348
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Paul Rosenstein
AFSCME
1625 L Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mayer Rossabi
Manhattan Comm. College
1633 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10019

Allen Rush, Field Coord.
Laborers' Training Program
Laborers' Intl. Union
500 S. Virgil Ave., Rm. 330
Los Angeles, Calif. 90020

Blin Scatterday, Chrmn.
Div. of Associate Studies
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

Stuart Schmidt
Temple University
Ctr. of Labor & Human Res.
1945 Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

Bob Schrank
Ford Foundation
320 E. 43rd Street
New York, N. Y. 10017

Kathy Schrier
Associate Director
Education Department
AFSCME, Dist. Council #37
140 Park Place
New York, N. Y. 10007

Will Scoggins
Professor
El Camino College
16007 Crenshaw
Via Torrance, Calif. 90506

Rochelle Semel
Cornell University
3 East 43rd Street
New York, N. Y. 10017

Al Shanker
President
American Fed. of Teachers
11 DuPont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Art Shy, Administrator
Education Programs
United Auto Workers
8000 E. Jefferson
Detroit, Michigan 48214

John Sloan, Director
Labor Center
University of Iowa
Phillips Hall, Rm. 25
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Dick Sneddon
Buffalo State College
1300 Elmwood Ave.
Buffalo, New York 14222

Hal Stack
Wayne State University
5475 Woodward Ave.
Detroit, Mich. 48202

Barbara Stanton
Program Specialist
Univ. of Hawaii-Manoa
1420-A Lower Campus Rd.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

John J. Sullivan
Assoc. Director
Amer. Council on Educ.
1 DuPont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Roberta Till-Retz
Dept. of History
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Ida Torres, V. P.
United Storeworkers, #3
1010 3rd Ave., Suite 300
New York, New York 10021

Fred Waggoner
Grand Lodge Rep.
I.A.M.
6828 Lake Washington Blvd.
Renton, Washington 98055

Paul Weinstein, Dir.
Program of Indust. Rel.
and Labor Studies
Div. of Behavioral & Soc. Sci.
University of Maryland
College Park, Md. 20742

James Wengert
Secretary-Treasurer
Iowa Federation of Labor
2000 Walker St., Suite A
Des Moines, Iowa 50317

Barbara Wertheimer
Dir., Women's Intitute
Cornell Univ., NYSSILR
7 East 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017

David E. Williams, Director
Education & Leadership Train.
AFSCME
1625 L Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Charlotte Wilson
Cornell University
7 East 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017

Dick Wilson
Staff Representative
Dept. of Org. & Field Services
AFL-CIO
815 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Vastina Wilson
ACTWU
Dept. of Education
770 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

Steve Wingard
U. S. Office of Education
Bur. of Student Fin. Asst.
Room 4661 ROB 3
400 Maryland Ave., S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

James E. Wolfe, Dir.
Research and Education
Intl. Molders Union
1225 East McMillan St.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206

Allen Zack
Assistant Director
Dept. of Public Relations
AFL-CIO
815 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

John Zalusky
Economist
Dept. of Research, AFL-CIO
815 16th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

James M. Zancanaro
Field Coordinator
Laborers' Training Program
Laborers' Intl. Union
3427 W. Club View Court
Mequon, Wisconsin 53092

Ben Zemsky, Director
Organization Department
American Postal Workers Union
817 14th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

AFL-CIO

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF

Walter G. Davis	Director
Edgar Czarnecki	Assistant Director
Dorothy Shields	Assistant Director
Jacqueline Kienzle	Staff Representative
William Lanxner	Staff Representative